LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

v. 20, 1815

D. W. Gerhard.

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE

THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

T. G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XX.—1873.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 ARCH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255

hep v.20,1873

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. INFIDELITY,—ITS PRINCIPLES,
By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M. 5

II. THE CRISIS IN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CRESCENT AND THE CROSS,
By Rev. John I. Swander. 28

III. THE NATURALNESS OF CHRISTIANITY,
By Rev. J. W. Steinmetz. 44

IV. THE MISSION OF PHILOSOPHY,
By Alexander Harris. 61

V. WOMAN'S CULTURE,
By Rev. J. H. Dubbs, A. M. 78

VI. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL MOVEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO THE CAUSE OF EDUCATIONAL RELIGION,
By Rev. J. Spangler Kieffer. 92

VII. CONSCIENCE AND THE VATICAN,
By Prof. J. S. Stahr. 117

VIII. REGENERATION AND CONVERSION,
By Rev. Wm. Rupp, A. M. 140

IX. THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN, . . . 172

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 175

APRIL NUMBER.

I. THE ROMAN QUESTION. . . . 181

II. FIRST DOGMATIC DECREE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, PUBLISHED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE HOLY ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN. 191

III. DR. DOLLINGER'S REPLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF MUNICH,
Translated by Prof. J. S. Stahr. 199

IV. THE GERMAN BISHOPS AS WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH.
Translated from the German by Rev. E. W. Reinecke. . . 213

V. THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT,
By President J. Williamson Nevin, D.D. . . . 240

VI. DOES A DIVINE CURSE REST UPON THE WORLD? 295

VII. THE TENDENCY TO INDIVIDUALISM IN THE GERMAN CHURCHES IN AMERICA,
By Rev. I. E. Graeff, ... 302

VIII. THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE IN AMERICA. . . . 317

ARTICLE PAGE

JULY NUMBER.

I. CHRISTIAN WORSHIP,
By Rev. J. O. Miller, D.D. 325
II. FAITH—NORMAL AND ABNORMAL.
By Rev. C. Z. Weizer. 346
III. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
By Rev. Samuel Miller. 366
IV. THE FALL AND ITS IMPORT.
By Rev. D. F. Brendle, A. M. 376
V. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH.
By Rev. J. W. Santee. 391
VI. THE LESSONS OF THE CHURCH YEAR NOT A PERVERSION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D. 422
VII. THE STUDY OF METHOD IN MODERN CHURCH HISTORY. 431
VIII. THE STARRY HEAVENS.
By Prof. Theodore Appel, D.D. 451
IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 468

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITY,
By Pres. J. Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D. . . . 469
II. SCRIPTURE VIEW OF DIVINE WORSHIP,
By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M., Mt. Alto, Pa. . . 487
III. THE SCOPE AND SPIRIT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH,
By W. Leaman, Esq., Lancaster, Pa. . . . 522
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM AS TAUGHT IN THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM,
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D. 537
V. DALTON ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM,
By Rev. F. K. Levan, A. M. 573
VI. THE UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN IN JESUS CHRIST,
By Dr. L. Schœberlin, Prof. and Consistorialrath in Gottingen. 583
VII. THE PRESBYTERIAN THEORY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, ... 682
VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. . . . 639

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1873.

ART. I.—INFIDELITY—ITS PRINCIPLES.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MONT ALTO, PA.

COMMON prudence suggests, that, in reference to all the higher interests of life, we carefully ponder the paths of our feet. Otherwise, we act irrationally. It is, indeed, the legitimate province of reason thoroughly to investigate any and every subject claiming our attention, and on the acceptance or rejection of which weighty and important interests are suspended. Before passing judgment, or coming to a final decision, therefore, our convictions should be so strong and clear as to render the correctness of our sentiments and the safety of our course morally certain. And where the nature of the subject is such as to require immediate attention, and to call for a positive answer, one way or the other, the observance of this rule is of peculiar importance.

Now, in virtue of our intellectual and moral constitution, as well as by reason of our social position, and the diversified relations of life which it involves, men will always adopt, and, in fact, must adopt some kind of religious belief, and shape their life and conduct more or less in accordance with this cherished faith. What precisely this religious belief and practice shall be, depends very much on circumstances—on our social and civil relations, on constitutional peculiarities, and especially on early associations and family training. But we may lay it down as a general and well-established rule, that, everywhere and under all conceivable circumstances, men will have some kind of religion, either true or false; and that, by virtue of an inward necessity, they will be more or less influenced by their favorite systems of thought and belief. Even for the present life, some kind of religion is necessary; without it, men would sink, hopelessly and in despair, beneath the accumulated mass and overwhelming burden of human ills. We need some prop to stay up and support our sinking spirits—some soothing cordial to allay our sorrows and dry up the bitter fountain of our tears. This prop is religion—this soothing cordial a cherished hope!

If, indeed, we are more than brutes, and have hopes and aspirations higher and holier than those of mere animals, then it naturally and necessarily follows, that, in some way or other, we seek to realize these hopes, and cherish these higher and holier aspirations. This spiritual effort constitutes the human element in religion—a movement upwards—a conscious relinking of the soul to God, the universal ground and source of its being! This effort, to realize what, by reason of our religious nature, belongs to us, can be put forth in two ways only—either, first, on the ground of mere nature, and so constitute natural religion, that is Paganism or infidelity; or, secondly, on the ground of a foreign supernatural mediation, and so pass over into the sphere of revealed religion, that is Christianity—the religion of the Bible.

Such a supernatural system of religion belonged already, incipiently at least, and in the way of type and shadow, to the ancient people of God—the Israelites; while the gentile world proceeded universally on the ground of mere nature. In modern times, or since the introduction of Christianity, substantially the same systems still prevail—the only difference being, that Judaism, or the religion of types and shadows, has been superceded by the true substance, or the fulfillment of these types and shadows in the person of Jesus Christ—in the mystery of the incarnation; while Paganism has, in civilized and Christian countries, assumed the more subtile and refined forms of Deism, modern infidelity, or practical Atheism.

Now, what the Jewish Law-giver most truly and strikingly said respecting the abettors of heathenism, in his day, that, we think, can be said still more confidently respecting the abettors of Deism or modern Infidelity, in the present day—"Their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

We propose, accordingly, to inquire into the comparative merits of these two systems of faith and practice—the Christian and the infidel—by contrasting the teachings of the two systems, respectively, on a few of the leading questions which pertain most essentially to our present and future well-being. And we now venture to assert, that, in the prosecution of our design, we shall be able to show conclusively, from the published sentiments of Infidels themselves, that "Their Rock is *not* as our Rock"—that there is, in fact, an infinite disparity between the two systems on all the leading questions of morals and religion, that the doctrines of the Christian system as far transcend the teachings of infidelity, in point of purity and excellence, as the splendor of the noon-day sun exceeds the flicker of a taper, or as the peerless gems in a royal diadem surpass, in beauty and brilliancy, the mountain rock or common quartz.

In the process of argumentation, we shall on each point, first give a condensed statement of the teachings of Divine Revelation, the faith of the simple-hearted Christian; and then contrast with these statements the published sentiments of Infidels, both ancient and modern.

And, first, as regards the being and perfections of God, and His relation to the world—what is the voice of Christianity? In reference to this point the Scriptures teach, and Christians believe, that there is but one living and true God—infinite in nature and perfections—spiritual and invisible; without body, parts, or passions; immense, eternal and omnipotent: "The Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning"—most holy, just, and only wise, "working all things according to the counsel of His own will"—gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and the avenger of wrong.

Such is the character of the Supreme Being, as represented in the Holy Scriptures; and His relation to the world is that of the Creator and Preserver of all things "visible and invisible," by whose paternal bounty and goodness the wants of all living creatures, rational and irrational, are daily and hourly satisfied. "Like as a father pitieth his children," says the Psalmist, "so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." And in another place, he expresses it thus: "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, Lord, and Thou givest them their meat in due season."

And what is the language of natural religion, or Paganism and Infidelity, on this all-important subject? What have they to say respecting God and His relation to the world?

It is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, to form a clear conception of what is taught by the advocates of nature and natural religion, as there is among them an endless diversity of opinions; but we may observe, in a general way, that before the light of revelation had taught men better things, Polytheism, or the belief in many gods, was almost universally prevalent in the world. Even where there was something like an approach to the doctrine of God's unity, it usually degenerated into a kind of cheerless pantheism or deification of the entire universe, and the consequent denial of a personal God or supreme intelligence, and the substitution, in His place, of an abstract impersonal world-spirit, a blind force or fate! This spirit was supposed to be equally present in all persons, places, and things—in the stars, and plants, and trees—in men, birds, and beasts, and creeping things; and hence each and all of these became, in turn, the objects of divine worship. And this senseless and degrading idolatry was not confined to the ignorant and vulgar only. Even the most intelligent and best of men—the eminent and world-renowned sages of ancient Greece and Rome, had but very confused and imperfect ideas concerning the Supreme Being, and the worship that became Him. So likewise in the Orient, the great mass of the people worshiped an untold number of deities, under all imaginable shapes and forms. The ancient Persians are said to have had twelve principal divinities, with a vast multitude of subordinate ones, each of which had a place in their affections, while their chief worship was offered to the sun, moon, and stars—symbols, possibly, or impersonations of the god of fire. Hence their most ardent devotions and best offices were tendered to the "hosts of heaven." The refined and classic taste of the ancient Greeks had deified all the social and civil virtues, graces, times, and seasons, and peopled heaven, and earth, and seas with their imaginary deities. In Imperial Rome—the proud and stately mistress of the world—the popular devotions were daily offered up at the consecrated shrines of her thirty thousand gods or more; while in Africa, and some of the South Sea Islands, the most costly gifts and sacrifices, extending even to human victims, were constantly offered in solemn service to the devil—the great spirit whom they adored—either to appease his anger and avert some impending evil, or to secure his aid and kindly offices. Multitudes of such wretched victims were daily brought, and laid, mangled and bleeding, upon the smoking altars of their insatiate divinities; and all this in the vain hope of propitiating the great world-spirit, and securing his favor and benediction!

Such is a faint and imperfect sketch of the ancient Heathen world; many of whose most prominent and characteristic features are still prevalent in different portions of the globe, as yet unvisited and unilluminated by the glorious light of the gospel. The picture shows us what man is by nature and without "the blessed gospel of the grace of God." As regards doctrine, modern Infidelity is not much in advance of its ancient compeer. Practically, indeed, the picture does not look quite so dark and cheerless as the one which we have just sketched; but this improvement is the result of a general diffusion of Christian principles, and the almost universal prevalence and operation of these higher and holier "powers of the world to come," and not of any material change in the system itself. In its own nature, or in and of itself, infidelity is just as bad now as it ever was; and its advocates of the present day, really, are just as devoid of principle, and of the nobler instincts of our nature generally, as those of any former period. Professedly, indeed, they reject the doctrine of a plurality of gods, and claim pre-eminently to be in favor of one Supreme Intelligence. But when you question them closely as to what they believe concerning the nature and perfections of the Supreme Being, their answers are as numerous and as diversified as the tongues from which they proceed. The Rationalists of Germany, the Deists of England, and the Atheists of France, as well as the skeptical scientists of more recent date, are all equally at a loss to say what exactly is the character of God and His relation to the world; and it is a notorious fact, ominously significant, that Infidels generally, or shall we say universally, are far more deeply and anxiously concerned about the gratification of their brutal lusts and passions than the worship and honor of God!

As regards the doctrine of creation, their sentiments are equally unsatisfactory. Some hold, with the ancients, that the world is eternal and uncreated; others that it sprang into being, and attained its present beautiful order and regularity of motion, by mere chance; and others, again, assert that it gradually grew into its present form by a certain mysterious process of nature, together with all its inhabitants. Man—the prince of creation—came, thus, according to Monbodda and Buffon, by gradual improvement from the monkey or baboon; and Dr. Darwin, an English physician of great eminence, dives still deeper into the mysteries of nature and of nature's processes, and bravely tells us that man's ancestry dates back as far as the oyster, at *least*, if not away beyond that, to a species of the most minute corpuscles formed at the bottom of the ocean, and thence, after ages of preliminary lingering in secret, gradually ascending in the scale of being, by successive improvements, until eventually each stood forth to view a full-grown man *or* woman, "with form erect and god-like mien."

And this is that superior glory of the higher philosophy—the sweet efflorescence of human wisdom and infidel speculation—the boasted discovery of that lofty and superior intelligence which deems the Bible unnecessary, and scoffingly derides and denounces its simple and unadorned account of the creation as absurd and visionary!

If, now, we bring this learned nonsense and absurd speculation up alongside of the Christian's simple, pure, and child-like faith in a Supreme Being—infinite in excellence, benignity, wisdom, power and majesty—the creator and upholder of all things—a "Father of the fatherless, and a husband to the widow," are we not fully justified in saying, that in this respect at least, "their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges?"

There is, in fact, not one redeeming quality—not a single consoling feature—in the infidel's creed. All is but a dreary, doleful, barren waste, on which not a solitary flower is seen to bloom. His God, if indeed he has any, is away off beyond the clouds—totally unconcerned about the affairs of men. His boasted belief in a Supreme Intelligence is wholly abstract, cold and chilly as a floating iceberg. Far more real, pure and comforting is the Christian's faith. In it there is a glow of generous love and sweet complacence. He feels that God is near at hand, "seeing that He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." Calmly and confidingly does he look up to God, calling Him "Abba, Father." Divine Providence is to him something real and consoling—the in-being in the world's history of God Himself, "for in Him we live, and move, and have our being." So near and dear unto us is God, so intimately are we related to Him, and so strong is our confidence, and so real and precious our interest, in the Almighty, that, according to the beautiful saying of the Apostle, our "life is hid with Christ in God; when, therefore, Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in Glory." We are thus closely identified with God in nature, interest, and honor; as another Apostle, St. John, the seer, also very beautifully says: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as He is pure."

Having disposed of the question concerning the existence and character of God, let us inquire, secondly, as to what constitutes, in the view of these respective systems, man's chief good, or the nature and properties of true happiness, and the means necessary for its attainment.

It is acknowledged, on all hands, that the desire of happiness is universal; and it is equally clear, we think, that in and of itself this desire is perfectly right and proper. It belongs legitimately to our original nature, as this came from the hands of God, and is accordingly admitted by all classes of men, universally, to be innocent and allowable, or even praiseworthy. But, when we come to inquire into the nature and properties of that happiness which is the object of this universally prevalent and ardent desire, and the course of conduct necessary for its attainment, the answers are greatly at variance, and sometimes even perfectly contradictory.

David says: "There be many that say, who will show us any good?" to which he responds, in the form of a prayer, "Lord, lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us;" thus intimating that HE esteems the favor of God as the *summum bonum*—the chief good of man. In accordance with this sentiment, he says, in a different connection: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in His temple; for in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion; in the secret place of his tabernacle shall He hide me; He shall set me up upon a rock. Therefore, will I offer in His tabernacle sacrifices of joy; I will sing, yea, I will sing praises unto the Lord."

Such is the language of the "sweet singer of Israel" in reference to the nature of true happiness. How is it to be attained? "Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" was the question proposed to our Lord by a young man, kneeling at His feet, to whom Jesus replied: "Keep the commandments." And when, on a different though somewhat similar occasion, it was demanded of Him: "Which is the great commandment in the law?" He answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole Law and the Prophets." John says that "God is light," and that, "if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." He adds: "These things I write unto you that ye sin not; and if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

According to these citations from the Holy Scriptures, it appears that Christianity places happiness in that purity of heart and life which both springs from and encourages communion with God and fellowship of men one with another, through the mediation of Jesus Christ. This view of salvation requires and encourages genuine devotion, disinterested friendship, virtue, and "holiness," especially, "without which no man shall see the Lord."

And what answer does Infidelity return to the question concerning man's chief good and the means for its attainment? Here again is found an endless variety. For, while some place happiness in a stoical indifference to passing events, and, in fact, to all merely outward circumstances; others adopt precisely the opposite view, and make happiness to consist almost exclusively in external circumstances—in eating and drinking, and making merry. Others again, especially among the ancients, imagined happiness to consist in the free indulgence of the sensual appetites, or mere pleasure and present enjoyment, and so on to the end of the chapter. "Cicero informs us that there was so great a dissension among the philosophers that it was almost impossible to enumerate their different sentiments, —that, while one sect affirmed that virtue was the sole good and its own reward, another rejected that notion in the case of virtue in distress, and made the good things of this life a necessary ingredient of happiness; and a third set up pleasure, or at least indolence and freedom from pain, as the final good which men ought to propose to themselves." On these confused and discordant opinions, Cicero very justly remarks that "they who do not agree in stating what is the chief end or good, must of course differ in the whole system of precepts for the conduct of life."

These remarks of the Roman sage—the eloquent orator and statesman—apply with equal justice and propriety to the discordant sentiments of modern infidelity, and we shall see that, as its advocates have no just and proper conception of man's dignity, or the true end and object of life, and consequently fail to discover the nature of true happiness and the course of conduct necessary for its attainment, so also have they no just and adequate conception of genuine virtue or piety, and hence have introduced an endless confusion into the sphere of morals and religion. When happiness is made to consist in sensual gratification, then, of course, there will be no room for the existence and cultivation of exalted virtues and noble sentiments. And then, correspondent with these low and unworthy sentiments will also be the general conduct of men in all ages of the world. Hence there is, in reality, a most intimate and wonderful correspondence between ancient heathenism and modern infidelity, both in principle and in practice. Let us briefly review these principles of life and conduct, and see how far they will go in leading men to the true end of life—the attainment of genuine happiness. What were the sentiments—the principles and practices—of the ancients?

Their principles of philosophy were in most cases notoriously false, and their morals corrupt, and even their religious rites and ceremonies infamous and abhorrent. Suicide, in certain cases, was not only allowed, but openly encouraged and commended. Lying or prevarication had a similar license, and was even deemed virtuous under certain circumstances. Malice, revenge, cruelty to servants, the exposure of helpless infants, and abuse of woman, were all of them extensively practiced, and allowed by the public authorities. Seneca, who ranks among the best and wisest of the ancients, pleads for self-destruction in all cases where life becomes burdensome. "If thy mind be melancholy and in trouble," says he, "thou mayest put a period to this wretched state. Wherever thou lookest there is an end to it. See that precipice; there thou mayest have liberty. Seest thou that sea, that river, that well? Liberty is at the bottom of it. That little tree? Freedom hangs upon its branches. Thine own neck, thine own throat, may be a refuge for thee from such servitude; yea, every vein in thy body." So, likewise, *theft* was publicly sanctioned, both in Egypt and Sparta—on the ground, possibly, that it sharpened men's wits and made them "smart." You may say that this is ancient heathenism, while WE are just now concerned with modern infidelity. Very well. We shall now proceed to show that while many things have changed and have assumed new shapes, either of beauty or of deformity, infidelity, or natural religion, as to its main features, is very much the same as it was in the days of Seneca and Cicero. Its most essential principles are just as corrupt and demoralizing now as formerly, and its resources for improvement as scant and inefficient as ever. In fact Nature can never rise above its own proper level; and hence natural religion, whether in the form of ancient heathenism or modern infidelity, can never lift itself and its advocates out of the sphere of the flesh. Its case is a hopeless one, both as regards its principles and its practices. Its teachings always have been, and always will be, demoralizing—destructive. Let us hear a few of the sentiments expressed by the champions of modern Infidelity, Deism, or practical Atheism:

LORD HERBERT declared "that the indulgence of lust and of anger is no more to be blamed than the thirst occasioned by the dropsy or the drowsiness produced by lethargy."

BOLINGBROKE asserts "that the chief end of man is to gratify the appetites and inclinations of the flesh; that modesty is inspired by mere prejudice; that polygamy is a part of the law or religion of nature; and that there is no wrong except in the highest lewdness."

HUME maintained that self-denial, self-mortification, and humility are not virtues, but are useless and mischievous; that adultery *must* be practiced if men would obtain all the advantages of life; that, if generally practiced, it would in time cease to be scandalous; and that, if practiced secretly and frequently, it would by degrees come to be thought no crime at all."

VOLTAIRE AND HELVETIUS advocated "the unlimited gratification of the sensual appetites; and the latter held that it is not agreeable to policy, to regard gallantry, or sensualism, as a vice in a moral sense; and that, if men will call it a vice, it must be acknowledged that there are vices which are useful in certain ages and countries."

These sentiments, which were promulgated, originally, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by some of the leading infidels of England and France, and, coming up again, fruited and flourished anew during the latter part of the past and the early part of the present century, are sufficient to show how uniformly they place human happiness as man's chief end in the gratification of the sensual appetites. However much they may differ, in other respects, on this one subject they all agree. In order to show that in reference to the essential principles of religion and morals, they were no less deficient, we shall cite a few more passages having reference especially to this point. One declares that "self-love is the great law of nature;" another, that "it is unreasonable to believe God to be wise and good;" a third, that "nothing can be more fatal to virtue than the weak and uncertain belief in future rewards and punishments;" and a fourth, that "man is a mere machine," and that "the soul is material and mortal." And, in one of the sessions of the national council of France, in the days of its infidelity, or atheism, rather, it was solemnly decreed that "God is nothing," and "death an eternal sleep."

During this period of national unbelief and senseless infatuation—this reign of terror—"public worship was utterly abolished," and "the churches converted into temples of reason."

Such, briefly, were the principles of religion and morality promulgated by the infidel schools of England and France, and such their idea of man's chief good, and of the course of life to be pursued for its attainment; and such substantially are the principles and practices still advocated by the enemies of Divine Revelation. The outward form may have changed, but the inner life and substance are precisely the same. If, accordingly, we were to propose to one of these modern skeptics the question: "What is thy only comfort in life and death?" we should, doubtless be answered thus: "My only comfort, sir, is to be wholly and absolutely my own master; to eat, drink and be merry; to gratify my fleshly appetite; believe God to be nothing, and death an eternal sleep;—this, sir, is my only comfort." Should we, now, turn to one of the little children of the church and ask: "What is *thy* only comfort in life and death?" that simple-hearted child would sweetly answer: "That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who, with His precious blood, hath fully satisfied for all my sins, and delivered me from all the power of the devil; and so preserves me, that, without the will of my heavenly Father, not a hair can fall from my head; yea, that all things must be subservient to my salvation; and, therefore, by His Holy Spirit, He also assures me of eternal life, and makes me sincerely willing and ready henceforth to live unto Him;" adding—"this, sir, is my only comfort in life and death." It will require but a small share of discrimination, we think, and still less of courage, to decide at once as to which of the above answers proves the more comforting, and, consequently, merits our preference!

We proceed, thirdly, to inquire as to the soul's immortality, and the certainty of a future life;—what are the teachings of the two systems, respectively, on these vital points?

Christianity speaks out its sentiments clearly and distinctly, and with the utmost confidence. It gives us full assurance of that which all would fain wish to be true. It has no uncertain sound—no hesitation. It speaks right up to the point, and positively asserts both the immortality of the soul and a future life of blessedness—including the resurrection of the body. "For, if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." It encourages men to "look for a city which hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God." It disarms death, and sheds light and beauty over the grave; for its garnered denizens are not dead, but asleep—"asleep in Jesus." It points the weary pilgrim to mansions of inimitable beauty in the skies; "For we know, that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

These are the sentiments, the hopes and aspirations, which Christianity puts into the lips of its friends and professors. What is the language of Infidelity on this subject? What has it to say for itself and its advocates?

Scarcely, indeed, can its feeble voice be heard, being both uncertain and tremulous. It knows absolutely nothing of that joyous confidence, that blessed hope, and those brilliant anticipations of future glory, which belong to the religion of Christ. It has, indeed, always had some in its ranks, who, amidst the general desolation, felt the strong impulses of an immortal life within, and have, in different ways, given expression to these loftier and nobler sentiments. Especially may this be said of the ancients—those immortal heroes and "seekers after truth" in the hoary past. But, in most cases, even the honored sages of Greece and Rome have spoken with painful hesitation, and often in gloomy despair. Let us briefly advert to their own sentiments for illustration. Socrates, the acknowledged prince of philosophers, expressed himself in the most cautious and doubtful terms concerning the soul's immortality and a future life of blessedness. Thus, shortly before his death, he said to his sorrowing friends: "I hope I am now going to good men, though this I would not take upon me positively to assert; but I am in good hope that there is something remaining for those who are dead, and that it will then be much better for good than for bad men." What has been said of Socrates, observes Mr. Horne, "may in a great measure be applied to Plato, the most eminent of his disciples." Both exhibited the same hesitancy and painful uncertainty. And Cicero, who stands pre-eminent among those who argued for the immortality of the soul, "labors under the same uncertainty that distressed *their* minds." After stating the several opinions advocated, he says very characteristically and sadly: "Which of these is true, God alone knows; and which is most probable, is a very great question." On all of which Seneca observes, that "immortality, however desirable, is rather promised than proved by those great men." And Horne, after detailing the statements of these ancient worthies, goes on to say that, "while the followers of these great philosophers were thus perplexed with doubt, others of the heathen entertained the most gloomy notions—imagining either that they should be removed from one body to another, and be perpetual wanderers, or contemplating the grave as their eternal habitation, and sadly complaining that the sun and stars could set and rise again, but that man, when his day was set, must lie down in darkness, and sleep a perpetual sleep." The same idea is also plaintively expressed by one of the Greek poets, thus:

"Alas! the tender herbs, and flowery tribes,
Though crushed by winter's unrelenting hand,
Revive and rise when vernal zephyrs call;
But we, the brave, the mighty, and the wise,
Bloom, flourish, fade, and fall; and then succeeds
A long, long, silent, dark, oblivious sleep:
A sleep, which no propitious Pow'r dispels,
Nor changing seasons, nor revolving years."

So sang the Attic poet; and his melancholy strains remind one of the mournfully sweet and beautiful Elegy of Horace, who, when his locks were whitening for the grave, sang out in elegant and pathetic verse the dearest hopes of his own warm and feeling heart. And what were these cherished hopes and pleasing anticipations of the good and warm-hearted poet? Not that he would shortly be the companion of angels and of the spirits of just men made perfect in heaven, but that he expected to become incarnate, and soar aloft high above the heads of the vulgar crowd, in the body of a beautiful "white swan;" and, even for this poor, chilling, dismal hope, and paltry lot, the only evidences were his snowy locks and the frost-like down upon his withered arms and hands!

We have detained our readers so long with recitals from the sages of antiquity in order to show how far honest and sincere inquirers after truth could go without the light of Divine Revelation. All these men sought earnestly and persistently after the truth; and, no doubt, they would gladly have embraced "the truth as it is in Jesus," had it been published among them. Indeed, one of them expressed the fond hope that God would, at some future time, make such a revelation of Himself and of a future life, as would satisfy the sincere inquirer, and safely conduct him to the realms of peace. Before leaving these honest and earnest seekers after wisdom, we will yet quote the dying words of the great and good Socrates, and contrast them with the words of St. Paul, under similar circumstances. "I am going out of the world," said the great philosopher to his friends, "but which of us has the better part, is a secret to every one but God." St. Paul, writing from prison to his beloved Timothy, in the immediate prospect of death, says: "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give unto me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing." Here, in brief, are the dying sentiments of two great men, representative and of world-wide reputation—the one a pagan, the other a Christian Philosopher; both are presumed to have been equally learned, earnest, and sincere; but the one speaks with painful uncertainty of a future life—the other with unshaken confidence, and holy triumph and exultation.

But we must pass on to another and less generous class of men—the champions of modern infidelity and practical atheism. What have they to tell us of the soul's immortality, and of a blessed life to come? What encouragement can they afford the suffering sons of sorrow? What comfort have they for the "weary and heavy laden?" What balm for the bleeding heart? What cordial for the broken spirit? What rest for the feet of the weary pilgrim? Let us inquire at their own mouth, and learn the answer from their own lips. Listen to their gloomy deliverances:

SHAFTESBURY, one of the most eminent of the British skeptics, affirms, as we have already seen, that "nothing can be more fatal to virtue than the weak and uncertain belief of future rewards and punishments." This would seem to intimate that *he* is the best and most virtuous of men, who can die like a brute and stolidly contemplate, in the grave, the monotony of an eternal sleep. For, if there is no hereafter, then death is the end of man—the last sad and mournful event in his cheerless history! No comfort here for the weary pilgrim, who, burdened and care-worn, lingers not on all his painful journey that he may the sooner receive his reward, and be for ever at rest in the land of promise!

MR. COLLINS teaches that "man is a mere machine," and that "the soul is material and mortal." He thus denies positively not only the existence of a future state, but even its very possibility, and sinks man at once to the low level of the brute creation. This heartless skeptic gives a death-blow to all the better hopes and aspirations of mankind, and leads the dying sons of men, uncheered and comfortless, to the regions of the dead. He knows apparently nothing of the blessed boon of life and immortality in the world to come.

MR. CHUBB holds that the "resurrection of Christ, if true, proves not the immortality of the soul"—that "the belief of a future state is of no advantage to society"—that "all religions are alike," and that, therefore, "it is of no consequence what religion a man embraces." In the view of this sagacious writer the gloomy superstitions of heathenism, and the boasted speculations of infidelity are of equal value with the blessed Gospel of Christ and its future inheritance "among the saints in light."

BOLINGBROKE asserts "that God does not concern Himself about the affairs of men at all—that the soul is material and mortal, and that self-love is the great law of our nature." This noble lord brings us still deeper into the cold and dismal regions of unbelief. He not only denies a hereafter, but also shuts out the light of God's countenance even from our present habitation—'He concerns Himself not about the affairs of men.' This eminent and learned skeptic seems never to have heard of the faith which teaches us to look up to heaven with child-like confidence, and say: "Abba, Father."

HUME goes still farther, and declares that "there are no solid arguments to prove the existence of God"—that "it is unreasonable to believe God to be wise and good," supposing Him to exist—and that "no reward or punishment can be rationally expected beyond what is already known by experience and observation." This is still worse, and more hopelessly gloomy and cheerless; reminding us of another skeptic of the same stamp, who is said to have died with this horrid prayer in his mouth: "If there is a God, I desire that He may have mercy upon me." How different is this dying scene from the triumphant death of the martyr Stephen, who, "being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God; and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and said, behold, I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God; and they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit; and, when he had said this, he kneeled down, and fell asleep." So dies the good man, calm, bright, and serene as the setting sun!

We will here close our citations from these heartless skeptics, who, in their aims and efforts, agree in nothing so fully as in the total subversion of all religion, and in the extinction of all our better hopes and aspirations; whose only object seems to have been to make life as infamous as possible, and death as gloomy and horrid as language could render it. The beautiful garden of the Lord must, if possible, be laid waste, every living plant and smiling flower destroyed, and their beauty and fragrance scattered to the winds or trodden in the dust.

So much for infidelity, its principles and its advocates. Much more might be said to show up its infamous and perilous character; but enough, we think, has been advanced to convince any unprejudiced mind that infidels are not just the best and the wisest men in the world, nor the safest leaders of the people; that their principles are, in fact, infamous and desolating, and wholly unsafe in their practical operations; and that, in every view of the case, "their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges;" that their boasted system has nothing in it to adorn and beautify human life, to elevate and improve society, to cheer the comfortless and afflicted ones, to sooth the sorrows of life, or give assurance in death; while Christianity possesses all these ingredients, and many more besides. It encourages, comforts, and sustains the living, and binds on the pallid brow of the dying saint the fadeless wreath of immortality.

Let us briefly illustrate this difference in the two systems. The year 1778 witnessed the death of the celebrated Voltaire, the most brilliant genius of his age, distinguished alike as an elegant prose writer, poet, and philosopher; but, unfortunately for himself and the world, an atheist and champion of French infidelity. He prostituted his vast intellectual and moral powers, his extraordinary natural endowments and eminent scholarship, to the spread of atheism and the subversion of the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. His watch-word, written at the head of all his letters, was "Ecrasez l'imfame," crush the wretch, meaning thereby our adorable Saviour. He is said to have died alternately supplicating and blaspheming the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. Suffering inexpressible anguish of mind, he would cry out in plaintive accents, "O Christ! O Jesus Christ!" And then complain in the most pitiful and heart-rending strains, that he was "forsaken of God and man," presenting a most horrid and horrifying spectacle to those who were present. In this last and most solemn scene on the stage of life, in this closing drama of his extraordinary career, at once so transcendently brilliant and so horribly gloomy, he found himself "having no hope and without God in the world," his sun going down in utter darkness and despair. So died the learned and distinguished Voltaire, the champion of French infidelity and practical atheism, the elegant poet, philosopher, and essayist. No one wishes to die as he died.

Let us now look at another picture, nearer home and more pleasant and cheering. In the year 1853, gently departed and "fell asleep in Jesus" a little child, infant son of the Rev. Dr. Schaff, after eight weeks of almost unparalleled suffering on the part of a child only about two and a half years old. With his own consent the painful operation of tracheotomy was performed, in order to extract a chestnut hull from his wind-pipe; and for three weeks the patient little sufferer breathed through the incision. During his protracted sufferings he would often, in childlike simplicity, say, "Heaven is a beautiful place; God is there, Christ is there, the angels are there, all good people are there." Near the close of his sufferings, in allusion to a child's hymn, which he had been taught, he said to his mother, "Ma, ma, I will fly up, up, up to heaven, like a 'little diamond in the sky.'" So died the little martyr, the gentle, submissive, patient sufferer, two and a half years old, who had been taught a few simple lessons in Christian piety. Who would not wish to die like that martyr lamb?

One scene more and we have done. Please, then, accompany me to a dark and dismal dungeon in the City of Rome, the mistress of the world. There on the damp, stony pavement, and chained to a rude and unfeeling soldier, sits an aged and venerable-looking man, small in stature, of dark complexion, with diminutive and deep-set eyes, stooped, sad, and care-worn, with an expression of deep and most earnest concern depicted on his countenance. We view him for a moment in silent awe and amazement, and then say, "Are you not Saul of Tarsus, the distinguished disciple of the learned and amiable Rabbi Gamaliel, at whose feet you sat, many a day an admiring pupil?" He answers, "Once, sir, I was; but now am Paul, called to be an apostle, a disciple of the meek and lowly Saviour, Jesus of Nazareth." "Indeed, and did you not formerly denounce, in unmeasured terms, the religion of Christ, and persecute even unto death the disciples of Jesus?" "Once, sir, I did," calmly and ingenuously answers the aged and illustrious herald of the cross, "but I did it in ignorance; and now I preach the faith which once I destroyed, and deem it my highest honor and sweetest employ to be engaged in the service of my Divine Lord and Master, according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death." "But did you not make a sad mistake in exchanging the established and popular religion of your illustrious ancestors for that of Jesus, the despised Nazarene?" "Not at all," is his ready reply; "I did, indeed, make heavy sacrifices in passing from the one to the other, but what things were gain to me, those I counted loss; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." "But will not your present deplorable situation and your prospective sufferings, in the cause which you have espoused, shake your confidence and despoil you of your present peace and of your future joyous anticipations?" "Nay, verily, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of

God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." "But what, if you should fall a victim to the malice and fury of your implacable enemies, and your life be thus sacrificed to your excessive zeal and fidelity in the cause of Christ, will not this blast your fond hopes and disappoint, sadly disappoint, all your bright and glowing anticipations?" "Not at all. For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Are you, and your companions in tribulation, and in the Kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, then prepared to undergo all these immense sacrifices, to be subjected to untold privations, persecutions, sufferings, and death even, if need be, for the love you bear to Jesus Christ and His blood-bought Church?" "Yea, truly; we are indeed troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh. And so the Holy Ghost witnesseth, in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions abide me; but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the Grace of God." Thus speaks Paul, the apostle. Such a hero infidelity has *never* produced, and what is far better still, such a hero infidelity never *can* produce.

When, for instance, has an infidel philosopher shown the noble and ingenuous spirit and heroic courage of Paul in the matter of humbly confessing his past errors, and cheerfully embracing the truth? A thousand times over have the corrupt principles of infidelity been confuted, and their legitimate tendency shown to be degrading and ruinous to men, and dishonoring to God; but in spite of all this, the advocates of these pernicious principles have remained unmoved. Verily such "men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil," and consequently they continue in their wickedness.

Again, when has an infidel or atheist, a free-thinker of the modern school, devoted himself, in the use of his moral and intellectual powers to the good of his fellow-men, and generously offered up, as Paul did, his life for the public welfare? Such an instance is not to be found in the whole range of infidel activity and skeptical philosophy. Such entire, disinterested, loving self devotion to the public welfare, is a virtue which adorns none but the Christian character, a jewel that sparkles only in the martyr's crown. Determined and persistent attempts at revolutionizing human society and elevating man in the scale of being were indeed once made by the French illuminati; but, alas, instead of benefiting mankind, their efforts brought in their bloody train only desolation and ruin—utter ruin. During that fearful period of bloodshed and violence, very properly called the reign of terror, society became perfectly disjointed, law and order subverted, the sacred soil of France drenched in blood; all sense of security, both private and public, was lost, every sentiment of humanity and religion banished from the breast, human nature degraded, and God dishonored and insulted, and the whole country, as some one says, "resembled one vast slaughter-house, slippery with blood and pollution."

And, finally, what infidel has ever deliberately faced danger and persecution in the defense of his cause, and sealed his testimony to the truth with his blood, as did St. Paul and a host of others, men who joyfully died for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus? In the early ages of the Church such heroism and fidelity to the cause of truth were quite common. "The blood of martyrs flowed in torrents. The heroism of confessors braved every danger. Bishops ruled at the peril of their lives." Men eminent in wisdom, piety, and station, joyfully gave up their lives for the wreath of immortality. "All the Bishops of Rome, for three hundred years, with only two or three exceptions, suffered martyrdom, and received the martyr's crown." Has infidelity such witnesses for the truth?

Ah! no! It has neither confessors, saints, nor heroes, who, while serving their Divine Lord, gloried in chains and dungeons; no blessed martyrs to wear the immortal diadem. They who habitually glory in their unbelief, and boast of their superior intelligence, despising the humble believer in Christ, do not even *pretend* to have any such moral heroes, such glorious champions of the truth, to grace their infamous retinue, or to impart dignity, eclat, and lustre to their faltering cause. Ashamed of their pernicious principles, they must yield without a struggle this honor to Jesus Christ and His holy religion. "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

ART. II.—THE CRISIS IN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CRESCENT AND THE CROSS.

BY THE REV. JOHN I. SWANDER, A. M., LATROBE, PA.

THE eighth century of the Christian era was born before the midnight of the mediæval age. The power of the Papacy had just started toward the throne of its despotism, while Paganism was tottering upon the verge of its decline. The figures upon the dial-plate of history seemed to indicate that the world had gone back to gather strength for progress. The Star of Empire no longer mapped its orbit in the land of Shem. Africa had become entangled in the meshes of a moral night whose abiding darkness has required no less than a Livingstone of the nineteenth century to penetrate its interior. America was unknown to the masters of navigation. Europe was the path of the world's progress and the field of its conflicts. Here the antagonistic legions of light and darkness entered the arena of mortal contest and struggled for the mastery over the elements involved. The skirmishes of other continents were of secondary importance in the performance of the world's great drama. The scope of the past had reached its meaning in the mystery of the cross. The Nazarene had solved the enigma of four thousand years. Judaism had fulfilled its peculiar mission

The sceptre had passed from the lion-tribe of Judah to the Lion of Judah's tribe. The uncircumcised civilization of Greece and Rome had been baptized in the Jordan of Christianity. The day of Pentecost had fully come, and, as a consequence, the Church had been born. The Herod of disappointed prejudice sought the young child's life to destroy it. Then heathenism breathed out threatening and slaughter. The bloody baptism of persecution had been administered to the infant bride, in the witnessing of the "noble army of martyrs." The first grand assaults of the gates of hell had not prevailed. The bush was not burned. The queen of heaven ascended the throne of worldly empire. The crown of Cæsar was foreign to the fair brow of her celestial majesty, yet she swayed the sceptre of Cæsar in the duty of self-defence and mission of self-development.

The wheels of Zion's chariot moved on. The faith once delivered to the saints had been crystalized into the Holy Catholic creed. Heresy had been repeatedly anathematized. The apocryphal writings of the New Testament had been detected, and the chaff winnowed from the wheat of inspiration. Northern vandalism had failed to raze the foundations of the New Jerusalem, which had come down from God out of heaven. The Church had grown to the period of her youth; her higher education was, therefore, in order. The lullaby of her nursery songs had served their purpose. She was called to put away childish things, but not to part with her childlike nature. The time was at hand for her to advance toward the upper circles of the Christian curriculum. Her discipline involved a passive suffering to endure, and a positive work to be done. The collection and preservation of all that was valuable in the museums of mythology, the composition of Christian literature, the constant correction of evil tendencies, the academic drill-march through the speculative subtilties of scholasticism were a few of the essential studies in her comprehensive "cursus" to the goal of graduation. This course she was called to pursue under the rod of correction. The great Principal sometimes placed this rod in the haughty hand of cruel pedagogues. Among these Mahometanism was not the most gentle.

That Mahometanism was raised up and tolerated of God for the purpose of applying the rod of correction and administering the moral tonic of discipline to the feeble and fallible elements of a finally infallible Church is an assertion not at all problematic in the light of Scripture and theological science. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth" is a Scriptural declaration as true of the Church in her organic wholeness and historical completeness as it is of any individual member thereof, in any given time of her development. This truth was demonstrated already in the typical era of God's kingdom in the world. The famine in Canaan; the bondage in Egypt; the afflictive meanderings of the wilderness; the conflict with the Canaanites; the contaminations of surrounding idolatry; the frequent invasions of Philistia's haughty cohorts; the yoke of Syrian oppression; the captivity in Babylon; and the cessation of prophecy in the "dark ages" of Judaism were thorns in the flesh for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. The day of the Lord Jesus dawned, but the night of Zion's affliction had not ended. The school of discipline was more thoroughly organized. The Church came up out of the wilderness of Judaism to enter the furnace, whose heat had seven degrees of intensity. From the day of Pentecost unto the auspicious morning of the Reformation, the royal road of Zion was a thorny path, with less peace than pleasantness. Neither did the millennium dawn in the sixteenth century. There was more tribulation than tranquility in that great self-emancipating movement of the Holy Catholic Church. The Romish side of the Catholic Church gives continued evidence of distress by its preposterous assumptions and infallible contradictions. When one popish bull enters the arena for the very purpose of taking another by the horns, the combat becomes not only sufficiently exciting to entertain a crowded amphitheatre, but also of such a nature as to render doubtful "the immaculate conception" of either combatant. But has the Protestant form of Christianity no fears to quell nor foes to face? Is it not subject to the same law of chastisement in some other form? Yes. Adverse winds have blown upon her *from* every point of the compass, while perverse internal tendencies have threatened to drift her from the safety of her legitimate moorings *toward* every point beyond the compass. And the end is not yet. Protestantism has not yet entered the Senior class. It is rather a Freshman with Sophomoric aspirations. "In the last days perilous times shall come."

These afflictive agencies and rods of correction are usually unconscious of their mission in the hands of Providence. Pharaoh knew not that he was raised up for the very purpose of illustrating God's power in the discipline and deliverance of His peculiar people. Nebuchadnezzar sought nothing but the ventilation of his vaunting vanity in the bitter bondage of the Hebrews. The scornful Babylonians knew not that the effect of their torturing tantalism was to increase the indispensable home-sickness of the weeping exiles when they required them to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. Thus carried forward by the unhallowed impulse of sordid selfishness, in the accomplishment of their own subordinate purposes, they generally ran into that excess of riot and cruel persecution, which rendered it necessary for the salvation of the elect, that either their days should be shortened, or their influence circumscribed by the hook of Jehovah's restraining power. 2 Kings 19: 28. The Saracenic power, whatever may have been the principal prompting of its founder, seemed, at least by times, to struggle for the complete conquest of this world and an immortality of sensualism in the world to come. With the irresistible impulse of contagion, and the abomination of desolation, it had swept the most civilized portions of two continents and commenced the circumvallation of Southern Europe, when Providence, at the battle of Tours, declared: "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

The records of that event are not as complete and satisfactory as might be desired. For much of what we have, we are indebted to Arabian chroniclers. From all sources we have enough to assure us that Anno Domini 732 was an epoch in history. Precisely one hundred years had elapsed since the death of Mahomet; precisely seven hundred since the death of the Great Messiah. How weak the comparison, how great the contrast between these two distinguished persons! The one was distinguished by all that is dark, doubtful and delusive in the annals of a false faith; the other by all that belongs essentially to the glorious revelation of life and immortality. Yet the first century of the Hegira had more pilgrims to Mecca than the seventh century Anno Domini had to the Holy Sepulchre of the world's Redeemer. How great the enthusiasm in the propagation of a fraud! How languid the fires of zeal in behalf of all that was worthy of being remembered in the past, embraced in the present, and hoped for in the future.

But Christianity was not asleep. Mahometanism, while it outwardly enjoined many sound precepts, was inwardly carnal, and, therefore, had the flesh for its strongest ally. Upon the other hand, Christianity involved a crucifixion of the flesh. Its mission was to cast out this Ishmael of Arabia with all the bond-woman's children (Gal. 4: 29, 30), whether marshalled under the Crescent or numbered with the embannered hosts of the conquering Cross. Under this view, we risk nothing by the assertion that Mahometanism had more religion than the Church. Its religion was of the world, and therefore the world loved and propagated its own. The Caliphs had more wisdom than the Christian Fathers. Their "sensual" and "devilish" sagacity from beneath was, however," in wide contrast with the "pure" and "peaceable" doveliness from above. Rapacity sharpened the scimetar of its warriors, and the clamorous rage of unbridled passion deafened its ears to the most plaintive pleadings of the vanquished. In its practical operations it manifested but little disposition to distinguish between Pagans, Jews, and Christians. While it claimed to be Catholic, it was indiscriminately cruel. Ishmael's hand was against every man. (Gen. 16: 12). Pagan idolatry, Greek mythology, Jewish ceremonies and Christian faith, alike, were labeled "infidelity." The pill was sugar-coated, but its contents were no less poisonous. The cause was made to appear plausible, but there was death in the pot. The system contained truth enough to deceive the nations (Rev. 20: 8), and falsehood enough to damn them for more than a thousand years. Its theory rejected everything but the mummery of the Alcoran, and embraced everything but the marrow of the Bible. It was born of the flesh, and of the flesh it inherited the capacity to comprehend all that fell within the compass of carnality. Into the dark bosom of this dreadful brotherhood the exploded paganism of the Orient could enter without any material change in the essential elements of its character. The paganism of the West had more constitutional vigor and independence, but was equally hostile in spirit to the principles of Christian civilization.

In this juxtaposition of the world's moral antipodes war was inevitable. Michael durst not bring a railing accusation against the devil when disputing about the body of Moses (Jude 9), neither durst Christianity play the pitiful poltroon when contending for the body of Christ. While Christianity attaches no special merit to the cultivation of military virtues, it recognizes the duty of self-defence, although the life and language of its author forbade the propagation of its principles at the point of the bayonet. Not so with Medina's monomaniac. As soon as he had room to marshal an army and followers enough to organize a battalion, he sounded the tocsin of war, and summoned the world to submit. The terms of surrender were dictated with the hilt of the sword, and their acceptance enforced with its point.

In the 115th year of the Hegira Providence placed this sword in the hands of Abderhaman. This veteran soldier and renowned commander of the Moslem cohorts, according to Arabian sketches of his character, was possessed of that personal probity which constituted him worthy of a better cause. Though not the cotemporary, his chapter in history was, in some respects at least, the complement of Attila's, who by his Hunnish hordes three hundred years before, sought to found the fabric of a pagan dynasty in the attempted destruction of Rome's Imperial powers, and the consequent subordination of that incorporated Christian element, in virtue of which the queenly mistress of the seven hills escaped the throes of sudden dissolution to pass down the current of gradual decline. His army was not as large numerically as the almost fabled hosts that followed the standard of the "Vandal King" to the bloody contest of Chalons, but superior in the possession of that fanatical fury which fans the fires of all religious intolerance, and sharpens the sword of all pietistic and political propagandism. With this bigoted fervor and fancy of a false faith they moved forward in their sanguinary sweep, sanguine of success.

> Elate and proud of that o'erwhelming strength
> Which, surely they believed, as it had rolled
> Thus far unchecked, would roll victorious on
> Till, like the Orient, the subjected West
> Should bow in reverence at Mahomed's name;
> And pilgrims from remotest Arctic shores
> Tread with religious feet the burning sands
> Of Araby and Mecca's stony soil.
>
> —SOUTHEY.

Thus the darkest delusion that ever duped the credulity of the world, or draped its children in mourning, seemed to march in the most unprecedented career of conquest. The prestige of victories already achieved, the prowess of their invincible arms, and the prospect of a sensual Paradise in the celestial embrace of ravishing beauty, made the battle-field a coveted amusement, and recklessness the better part of valor.

By such a fraternity of fraud, filled with such infatuation of fanaticism, commanded by the experience and skill of an idolized chieftain, the Saracenic standard was borne along the path of unparalleled desolation. Along this path what monuments of wantonness! What imprisonment of conscience! What a painful panorama of wretchedness and ruin! What acts of violence to the sanctity of person! What a devilish demolition of domestic endearments! What cruel conflagrations of homes and hamlets, while Pluto's pencil painted the horrors of hell upon the glaring canvass of the midnight sky. One half the Roman Empire had been torn away by its ruthless grasp. Persia was prostrate under Islam's heel. Syria had followed he fate of Jonah's gourd. Palestine had surrendered the graves of Jehovah's true prophets, and the holy sepulchre of the prophet's true God to the feet of sacrilegious desecration. Egypt was scourged in a manner which in contrast gave a merciful appearance to the visitation of Pharaoh's frogs. The pestilential simoon of Arabia then wafted the invincible armada over the bosom of the Mediterranean. Spain bowed the suppliant knee, and furnished fuel for the fires of the conquering host that crossed the Pyrenees and came down into Gaul "like the wolf upon the fold."

Here let us pause and glance at the situation. Northwestern Europe was then only partially emancipated from the chronic thraldom of heathenism, and had therefore comparatively little strength to resist the well-organized powers of a false faith, whose fires of wild enthusiasm found combustible elements in every principality and province of an unregenerated world. True, the night was far spent, and the day was at hand, but the Sun of Christendom had not yet arisen sufficiently high to disperse the dense fog of its marshy lowlands. Christian civilization was just peeping through the twilight of approaching day. Society was yet rude and incoherent. There was no strong government west of the Rhine, and but little political permanence north of the Alps. There was uniformity in nothing; restlessness in everything. Imperialism had proven distasteful, and Feudalism was beginning to prove disastrous. The moral malaria of social disintegration floated in every breeze. The tree of Christianity had, indeed, been planted by the rivers of the North and West, but its sanitary leaves had not yet manifested their full power in the healing of the nations. From Britain to Burgundy and from Spain to Flanders, the country was "a chaos of uncombined and shifting elements." Dynasties transmitted the scepter with a trembling arm, and more frequently transferred it with the bloody hand of assassination. Princes were the puppets of a restless royalty, and the people more the subjects of contingencies than of crowns. Under these circumstances the army of Islam approached to thrust the gall of bitterness into the bitter cup of Gaul. Where was the rock of refuge against the rolling billows of fanatical vandalism? What painful solicitude must have ruled the hour! No doubt the prayers of Christian faith, as well as the pleadings of pagan patriotism, ascended from many anxious hearts and quivering lips:—

> "When wilt Thou save the people?
> Oh, God of mercy! When?
> From fraud and despots—tyrants!
> By hearts and homes and men!
> Shall crime breed crime forever?
> Strength aiding still the strong?
> No! say the mountains; No! the skies,
> Our clouded sun shall yet arise,
> And songs ascend instead of sighs.
> God save the people!"

But where was the man for the times? The master-wheel of Providence performed another revolution, and the Lord's anointed passed under the consecrating horn.

Charles Martel was the chosen "Hammer" in the hands of Him who is "strong and mighty in battle." This conquering hero of the age was Duke of the Austrasian Franks, the noblest representatives of Germanic Gaul. The historian's impartial pen makes favorable mention of his personal worth, as well as the experience, skill and prudence of his military career. These qualifications, illuminated by the brilliancy of his capital achievement, made him the worthy grandsire of Charlemagne, as well as that illustrious monarch's harbinger to the unsettled sovereignty of an ephemeral empire. To Charles all eyes were turned; in him the converging elements found a centre; and around him all the available forces were organized. His soldiers were not all Christians, yet they seemed to be men of hearts, and homes, and honor. In defence of all that was hallowed at home and dear in life, such an army could rally without any dangerous divergency of sentiment. There was a principle of union that made discord impossible, and a principle of honor that "turned the coward's heart to steel, the sluggard's blood to flame." Many of the Mahometan soldiers cared more for the gratification of passion than for the propagation of faith. The high-minded sons and virtuous daughters of Germany knew the meaning of a Moslem victory, and with fearful forebodings anticipated the wretchedness of the vanquished. Everything sweet in human existence, sacred in family relations, and hopeful in the budding promise of posterity, called them to strengthen the ramparts of their domestic citadels. The dawning rays of the Christian religion had added new charms to the native endearments of the hearthstone. Should these be surrendered without an attempt to defend their sanctity, and a determination to avenge their violation ? Some nations seem fitted only for servitude and its consequent disgrace and degradation. Their necks seem to have been made and moulded to a special order for the yoke. Not so, however, with the Teutons. They have for many centuries demonstrated the almost axiomatic assertion that no people can be enslaved except those that are unfit to be free. Such was the blood that permeated the veins of the men who marshalled at Tours to defend Europe from the legions of Saracenic invasion. No doubt their fervent prayers to heaven were succeeded by a breath of bold defiance to their enemies :

"By the shades beneath us,
  And by the gods above,
We dare your cruel hatred,
  Despise your cruel love.
Our bride-groom's arms shall still enfold
  An unpolluted bride,—
Our daughters' beauty still inspire
  Their father's heart with pride;
Lest when our latest hope is fled
  Ye taste of our despair,
And learn by proof, in some wild hour,
  How much the wretched dare."

Historians locate the battle-field upon the Loire, probably one hundred and fifty miles south of modern Paris. It was in the summer of 732. The exact date is unsettled. The event lives in history, not so much by the precise time of its occurrence as by the perpetuity of its influence. The army of invasion had already desolated Southern Gaul, one of the garden spots of the continent, and was concentrating its lines around Tours. This boa constrictor from the torrid clime of fanaticism, having gorged itself upon the blood of millions, was about to encircle the inhabitants of another city within its fatal folds and fangs, and glut the cravings of its insatiable maw. The torch of wanton sacrilege was applied, both to the venerable shrines of heathenism and the newly consecrated altars of Christianity. Then came the turning-point in the conflict between the crescent and the cross. "King Caldus" flew to the rescue. Heaven championed the cause of humanity. The bugle of holy war converted cowardice into courage, and imparted strength to the weak. The great "cloud of witnesses" bent anxiously over the balusters of heaven. For seven days the respective armies charged and countercharged, while the swelling current of the Loire carried its crimson contents to the Atlantic. As the combat deepened success seemed to be settling upon the sanguine stars of "hate's polluted rag." The Christian army was driven to the vengeance of despair. Man's extremity was God's opportunity. Heaven embraced the opportunity and revealed a propitious arm. The enemy became impatient for the spoils, and hastened away to consume them upon their lusts. Their ranks were consequently broken. The Saracenic army was stricken with the paralysis of sudden demoralization. Abderhaman tried to bring order out of tumult. He fell in the attempt. The battle was decisive Victory perched upon the banner of Christian civilization, and the star of hope arose above the horizon of Europe.

What would have been the course of all subsequent history and the present condition of the world, if Charles had lost the battle of Tours? What effect would a defeat have had upon the budding energies of the German race, which was then just arising to occupy a central position and exercise a controlling influence in every department of the world's progress, upon every continent of its territory, and through every age of its future? In the event of such defeat France might have become, what she has since been in fact, a prominent figure in the field of diplomacy and the dictatorial mistress in the world of fashion, but her territory could not have been consecrated by a Christian Normandy, with a race of energetic men. No Normandy, and there could have been no proud Paladin of his age—William, the Conqueror,—even though Duke Robert had seen Arletta's pretty foot twinkling in the brook with fascinating charms. No William the Conqueror, and there could, or would have been no opening of Saxony's veins at Hastings, and no transfusion of chivalric Norman blood. No Norman conquest, and there would have been no epoch of English nationality in the regeneration of British jurisprudence at Runnymede. No Runnymede, and there would have been no Magna Charta for the mother country, and none of its immunities for her colonial children. What then?

Let us launch the bark of our inquiry upon the current, and navigate the waters of another hypothetical stream. Shall we say of that great crisis, "It may justly be reckoned among those few battles of which a contrary event would have essentially varied the drama of the world in all its subsequent scenes?" * In such different event, would the mosque's dark domes point to the heavens that are now penetrated by the Church steeples and cathedral spires in every corner of an expanding Christendom? Shall we say, in the sneering dialect of Gibbon's infidelity, that a different result would have interpreted the Koran in the classic halls of Oxford, and demonstrated the revelation of Mohamed in the pulpits of the British realm? If Western Europe had not spurned the Saracenic yoke a thousand years ago, would the Western world be free to-day? Would Spain have discovered this country? Would England have colonized it? Would France have liberated it? Would Germany have intellectualized it? Would Christianity have civilized it? Would the Church have Christianized it? Would God have done any or all of these things, through any or all of these agencies? If not, what then? And so on to the end of the chapter; but where *is* the end of the Chapter?

---

* Hallam's Middle Ages.

A desire to pursue such a line of speculative inquiry can certainly find a field sufficiently large for full gratification. Under one view, the event at Tours was no more important than any one of a million others with less prominence and no record upon the pages of written history. Besides, this path of inquiry would lead us to ask about the "what might have beens" of an alternative result in the events of the most acknowledged influence upon the destiny of the world. What if Herod had succeeded in destroying the "Young Child's life?" What if Satan had succeeded in the attempted destruction of the tempted Nazarene? What if the bitter cup had passed from the suffering Saviour in the gloomy garden? What if Judas had failed to carry out the programme of his perfidy? *Could he have failed?* If Christ was delivered into the hands of His enemies "according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," are not His enemies delivered and destroyed according to the same determinate counsel? Did the Heavenly Dove of victory overshadow the standard of Charles without the Father's corresponding approbation: "I am well pleased?" Did not Jehovah intentionally break the Saracenic bow asunder? Admitting the proper freedom of the human factor in this as in all organic links of history, we do not propose to be laughed out of countenance for asking the question: "How much room was there for a different result?" Was there room for the slightest possibility of an alternative? How far does the subjunctive mode find place in the grammar of the absolute Jehovah? Does the flower of the world's history run the gauntlet of a thousand contingencies to bloom in fortuitous fragrance? Will there be an occasion, at the end of the world, for a general congratulatory thanksgiving of the universe because the fecundous womb of history escaped the disaster of a universal abortion? Does the freedom of the finite factor involve the possibility of such an abortion? If not, does history not involve a necessity, an internal guarantee of continual progress toward an eternally predestinated point? Is this fatalism? Without such fatalism would there not be a possibility and consequent danger of fatal termination?

We step back that a greater may advance to the front of the stage. Hear him: "*History is God's way in the world.* It proceeds, not by chance. It is a process by which the purpose of the Divine mind is continually carried forward among men, towards its given end, to the full resolution of the end involved in it from the beginning." According to the above, there is no room for any contingency that could possibly turn the main stream of God's onflowing purpose from its eternally ordained channel, but room enough for the full freedom of all the factors, human and divine. Neither is there any room for supralapsarian fatalism, but room enough for supreme sovereignty. History, then, is not a catalogue of collected events in the order of their occurrence, but the continued revelation of God in the evolution of the world's constitutional forces. The devout and orthodox historian neither identifies God with the world, nor separates Him from it. He is adored in the majesty of His *distinct* existence and praised for the beneficent *presence* of His all-controlling and disposing power. Under this view, the development of the world's forces is recognized as the path of Providence. To be, for the historian, a path of peace and way of pleasantness, it must be seen, not from the metaphysical stand-point of a divine decree, but the Incarnation—the central observatory of the moral heavens. Here we have a cross that gems the middle, radiates the periphery, and maps the path of the world's true progress. This path is the orbit of the Holy Catholic Church. This is the central and normal current of the world's on-flow. All tributary agencies converge along this channel. There may be eddies and countercurrents along the banks, and even in the centre of the stream, but the gates of hell shall not prevail. The Mahometan movement was such an adverse power. It has been measurably overcome by the Providence of God through the dynamic forces of His own progressive kingdom, which ruleth over all. How our faith is comforted under this organic and panoramic view of Creation's problem with Christianity's solution! In this congenial atmosphere it can arise above the shadow of tormenting skepticism and leap over the moss-covered walls of metaphysical subtleties. "The Son of God from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends and preserves to Himself a Church, chosen to everlasting life, *and I am, and for ever shall remain, a living member thereof.*"—Heid. Cat., p. 54.

A false idea of history is not the least heresy of this age. This, of course, is the counterpart of an unsound philosophy. We have "Histories of Philosophy"—piles of accumulated erudition; but where is our "Philosophy of History?" There is room in our libraries for just such a work—a call in our colleges for just such a teacher, and an emptiness in our popular faith for just such a comforter. The literary world has a chronic diarrhœa of chronological scribblers, and a corresponding costiveness of genuine science in the department of history. The true historian, instead of writing for the purpose of narrating events, uses events as figures upon the world's dial-plate, to indicate the direction of its current, illustrate the nature of its problem, and point out the progress of its solution.

The onflow of the world, in the strict and proper sense of history, cannot be realized and appreciated by that sort of philosophy which does not recognize the organic wholeness and finite headship of humanity. This, again, is equally impossible, without the corresponding recognition of Christianity in its proper historical character. But Christianity cannot be viewed in its concrete and essential character without a corresponding view of the Church in the sense of the creed, and the legitimate interpretation thereof. Church history is the arch of all history. The Incarnation is the key to the arch. Gibbon saw the fall of Rome; he had no faith to see the rise of Zion. Gibbon wrote from the stand-point of the world's infidelity; others from the stand-point of infidelity within the compass of the covenant. There may be a collection of fragmentary facts from the martyrdom of St. Stephen to the bloody night of St. Bartholomew; there may be an attempt to show the relation of cause to effect in the introduction of great events; there may be a partially successful analysis of certain tendencies in any given age; there may be a complete Encyclopedia of all theological tenets and ecclesiastical movements, with a portraiture of all the prominent actors upon the stage, but there can be no legitimate Church history written from any other stand-point than that of a truly historical, Holy Catholic Church, which is the necessary, organic continuation of the new power brought into the organism of humanity in the Son of God's conception by the Holy Ghost and birth of the Virgin Mary, for the very purpose of stemming the current of the world's false movement and directing its ransomed energies upon the tidal waves of grace to glory.

Occupying this position, the view is commanding and cheerful. With such faith we have no occasion to apprehend a failure. God's purposes will ripen and the world's forces be developed in a line parallel with the progress of the Redeemer's Kingdom. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea by the combined agencies of the world, the flesh and the devil. The rage of the heathen, the despotism of the papacy, the anarchy of rationalism, the waning power of Mahometanism, the infidelity of the world and the gates of hell, shall spend their force in vain. The spiritual children of Isaac will soon inherit the ripest fruit of the promise, and the carnal posterity of Ishmael be rescued from the debris of an exploded hallucination.

ART. III.—THE NATURALNESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. J. W. STEINMETZ, DANVILLE, PA.

SIGNIFICANT and humbling was the motto upon an ancient temple door—"Know thyself." For who can lay his hand upon his heart and say, I know myself? Nay, who can take the humblest flower and say, I understand this perfectly? Concerning many simple things, we cannot answer half the inquiries of the mind. To find mysteries we need not go to the supernatural order of the spirit world; for this world is full of them. All orders of life, and their subsistence upon inferior things, confront us as mysteries. The circulation of sap in plants, and of blood in animals has not yet been thoroughly mastered. And unenlightened by revelation, no man can know anything of the origin or reason of objects around us; can have anything but the merest notions concerning them; and even when these notions are systematically arranged they are unreliable, for notions are not science. Our knowledge is limited on all sides by the unknown.—We move in the midst of mysteries. Would we could do it reverently.

But why are all things so full of mysteries? If things are so full of mysteries in themselves, they are still more mysterious by reason of that which lies back of them, causing, conditioning, and upholding them. This causing, conditioning, preserving power, is the Will of God Himself, who is the Author of matter and spirit, nature and Grace. Thus matter and spirit cannot be antagonisms.—Hence it was so easy for Christ to work miracles in the very bosom of nature, yet with a power that was evidently above it. These miracles were natural in the sense that they were not unnatural nor anti-natural. True He cursed a fig-tree so that it withered; yet, how many trees does God yearly destroy by "stormy winds, fulfilling His Word?" Yet, surely, this is natural.

From this intimate relation between matter and spirit, nature and grace, Jesus drew also His many parables. He illustrated truths in the kingdom of God by the earthly avocations of life, and by facts of daily occurrence in nature around us—facts, which from their very commonness, and our familiarity with them, dull our perceptive capacities, so that we see not their marvelousness. Jesus did not say, a comparison *can be made* between the kingdom of heaven and a mustard seed; but, "The kingdom of heaven *is like* to a grain of mustard seed which a man sowed in his field. Jesus did not *make* the comparison, but simply *disclosed* it to our understanding; for the similarity lies in the very constitution of nature and grace, and in their relation to one another. Every sphere and branch of nature, owes its unvarying regularities to the previously existing, creative, organizing, and preserving power of God's Spirit, Who brooded upon the face of the chaotic deep. In His own image, and after His own likeness, did God make man; which extends so far, that we can even recognize the impress of the Holy Trinity, as being adumbrated in the three-fold constitution of our personality—body, mind, and spirit. And Moses was expressly commanded to make the tabernacle after the pattern God had showed him in the mount. Nay, what is to hinder us from regarding the entire order of nature, as being formed after the prior order of the spirit world? Why may not the things on earth be copies of the things in heaven?" Milton makes an angel of his own creation to say:

"What if earth
Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
Each to the other like, more than on earth is thought?"

From Tholuck's Book, Gathered Flowers from Oriental Mysticisms, we transcribe the following:

"The world of sense, is a shadow of the spirit world,
From which flows forth the nourishing milk for this
And feelings are captive monarchs
Concealed in the prison-cells of phrases.
When infinity enters the heart of the wise,
He must rise to its proper understanding,

> Which must preserve for him the shadowy forms
> Wherewith he can declare the infinite.
> Yet perfect no image ever is—
> Self-knowledge alone confers true benefits—
> For would'st thou draw lessons from every image,
> Thou must here much rescind—and there complete."

St. Paul says, "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." "The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Trench says, beautifully: "The denial of this truth is always possible; yet the lover of truth which shall be loftier than himself will not be moved from his faith, reflecting that however man may be the measure of all things here, yet God is the measure of man. That the same Lord who sits upon the throne of His glory in heaven, doth with the skirt of His train fill also His temple upon earth; that the characters of nature, which everywhere meet our eyes, are not a common but a sacred writing, even the hieroglyphics of God; and that the lover of this truth counts this his blessedness, that he finds himself in the midst of such, and so never without admonition or instruction." "Thus, besides His revelation in words, God has another and an older, and one indeed without which it is inconceivable how the other could be made, for from this it appropriates all its signs of communication. This entire world with its kings and subjects, its parents and children, its sun and moon, its light and darkness, its sowing and reaping, its sleeping and waking, its births and deaths, is from beginning to end a mighty parable, a great teaching of grand supersensuous truth, a help to both our faith and understanding." All nature, or creation, being such a parable, teaching and revealing that which caused and conditioned it, after the pattern or similitude of which it was fashioned, and which it foreshadowed; the coming of this substance itself in proper form and manner, must of necessity be natural also. This creation must have been formed with a view to the New Creation accomplished through Jesus

Christ our Lord—by whom, God also made the world at the first. Thus Christianity, the Religion named after Him, must be natural also. And the showing of this naturalness shall occupy us for the present.

The best way to define a term is to give its derivative sense. This is especially necessary as there has been so much disputing concerning the term "nature." So far as the word itself is concerned, it is derived from the Latin "natura," which means "a striving to become" or "be born." This would imply the idea of progression. That the thing or object called by this name, would not be complete at once, but that by a gradual unfolding or development it would attain its perfection.

In correspondence with this idea, the ancient Pantheists believed, that God, as the world-soul, had been gradually manifesting Himself in His struggles to attain self-consciousness. The first result of which effort was regularity in the mineral kingdom; the second, in simple life and growth as in the plant; the third, the power of sense and movement as in the animal; the last and highest, in self-consciousness, reason and will, as in man. And that in all the studies, meditations, labors, and longings of man, this world-soul or divinity was struggling to elevate itself and become independent of matter, which the ancient philosophers held to be essentially evil.

We accept the definition of the term nature, as "a striving to be born." We also believe in the progression of creation by periods, as the sciences demand and the Bible affirms. We believe also that God revealed Himself in the progressive stages of creation. But we neither believe that creation is an emanation from, nor an embodiment of God, but simply a manifestation of Himself; nor that it is the result of a struggle after self-consciousness, but rather a manifestation of His self-consciousness, for all is made according to a definite plan as we shall see. Neither do we believe that matter is coeval with God nor that it is essentially evil.

We believe that God created the matter of the universe, and gradually fashioned it according to His will; even as He is now modifying it according to this same will, which, on account of its regularity and unchangeableness in all its relations, men without faith have termed it the Laws of Nature. We further believe that God added creatures more perfect in proportion as the end was reached. Nevertheless creation in its lowest form was nature, as well as before and after each successive manifestation of creative power.

In reference to this earth we are told "that the Spirit of God moved, or brooded upon the face of the deep," of course arranging the elements, separating the earth from the water—or solids from fluids.—Geology teaches us, that the rocks were formed by sedimentary deposition, according to the laws of mineralogy, similar particles of matter coalescing according to their elective affinity. So that the crust of the earth is composed of different materials systematically arranged around the entire globe. The earth as thus complete in itself, consisting only of the mineral kingdom, surrounded by gases and washed by waters, was nature. And astronomy brings strong presumptive proofs to light that go to show, that there are stars even now which are composed of inorganic matter alone. Such our earth must have been, before the creative fiats of Omnipotence successively clothed it with verdure—filled it with animals—and peopled it with man. These stars which are void of gases and fluids are not below nature, or unnatural. Neither was our earth before the creation of the organic existence upon it. The sun was its centre then as now—it performed its annual and diurnal revolutions as at present. The ocean heaved its tide under mysterious lunar influences. The atmosphere generated heat in chemical union and action with the solar rays causing currents of air or winds. The earth, barren of vegetation, its waters void of fish or reptiles, its atmosphere uncleaved by wing of bird, was all silent and dead. And yet this was nature—and all of nature then. This insensate though arranged matter could not possibly anticipate, or comprehend, anything higher. Neither could it unfold or develop into anything nobler. It was as such complete and perfect in itself.

Unbelievers have done their utmost to establish a development theory, viz., that all life developed out of matter. They have failed to discover either in the fossiliferous rocks, or in present times a single monad or atom in the transition process from the mineral kingdom into the vegetable. Had particles of mineral matter by way of internal development advanced into the vegetable kingdom then would this latter have been a growth from the former, and as such a natural production. But this is philosophically impossible—the researches of Geologists decide emphatically against it, and thus confirm the teachings of the Bible that vegetation was a new creation. That it did not originate from inanimate nature either solid, fluid or gaseous—but was introduced into the mineral kingdom as a new principle, and by a power higher and foreign to it. The implantation of seed, and its growth are both facts supernatural to the mineral kingdom. And yet the earth was created directly for the vegetable kingdom. And this kingdom which is to us so natural, is still supernatural to the mineral kingdom. In the vegetable kingdom life was introduced, and development commenced. Through it the bare earth is clothed, beautified, adorned. And here again these two kingdoms, (the vegetable living in the bosom of the mineral subsisting upon, and ennobling it) these, were all of nature. Anything higher they could of themselves not anticipate or comprehend; neither could they develop into it. The mineral always remains a mineral—the plant always remains a plant,—it develops but only its own proper characteristics. Each order is fixed in its own sphere. And because the subjects of each kind, mineral, vegetable and animal existence, are thus bound by absolute and inflexible laws, the name kingdom has been assigned to these different orders in. nature. Each has a nature separate and distinct and inconvertible. So that all beyond these two kingdoms was supernatural to them. Anything which they could not produce, lay beyond their province and order of existence. And as the plant cannot develop itself into an animal, the latter is supernatural to the former, and proves that what the Bible teaches is strictly true, that the animal kingdom was a new creation. The same is true of the human kingdom. The difference between it and the animal kingdom is even greater than that which exists between the vegetable and the mineral, or between the animal and vegetable kingdom. Each higher kingdom is supernatural to every lower, has come to it from above and from without, and not grown up from below, or from within. True they all occupy the same place locally, but characteristically they occupy different stages in the scale of being.

The addition of each higher kingdom lifted up all those orders of existence lower than itself. This shows progression, advancement. And yet it must be evident to every reflective mind that has not set out in its thinking with the purpose to dispense with the Creator in the formation of the universe, that these higher orders of beings are not productions of the lower. Their natures are so vastly different, the higher being strictly supernatural to the lower, so as to demand absolutely the exercise of new creative wisdom, life, energy and power to call them into existence.

Man though he lives upon the earth and subsists upon its products, yet spiritually he moves in quite a different sphere from the animal, which has even no mind. He stands upon a higher level, and is so evidently supernatural to it. Here then we have the mineral kingdom, the vegetable kingdom supernatural to it, and the animal kingdom supernatural to both, and last the human kingdom supernatural to all these. Each natural in itself, and yet each higher is supernatural to all the lower—unanticipated by them before its creation, and remaining for ever incomprehensible to them as they lack the capacities necessary to understand them. The lower can only receive the higher into their bosoms, from which the latter draw their subsistence; as did David's greater Son, His from the breast of His Virgin Mother.

Did intelligences even higher than man, inhabit a planet abounding in vegetable life, but destitute of animal life—the creation of the latter would be strictly a supernatural act for them—though animals considered in themselves would be far inferior to the intelligences inhabiting that planet. Left to themselves these intelligences higher than man, could never supply the deficit of the animal kingdom—so that there could be no other way than that of a new creation.

Nature so far as we are acquainted with it, is thus no development of an atom or monad as some would have us believe.*

Nature instead of being the development of a monad or atom is much rather as creation in successive stages, the unfolding of the Divine idea or plan actualizing and externalizing itself. God did not only create new forms, but rather new life and powers that took upon themselves new forms. The entire creation below man is bound to be just what it is—it can become nothing more, nothing less. It possesses no mind, hence it cannot learn—not advance or rise—no consciousness, no freedom, hence it cannot transgress or fall, and is not accountable for its actions. As such its individuals are only things. Man on the other hand is not a thing but a person, and hence a power. God made him free, endowed him with power to choose between good and evil. He originates and causes, and acts thus in a way supernatural upon that which is beneath him. Man, with his spirit being related to a higher world, and with his body being related to all terrestrial natures fell in abusing his freedom by choosing the wrong, dragged all nature with him, producing disharmony in the bosom of nature, and entailed, upon all things, ruin.

All woes which each man experiences, his longings and restlessness, and all the sad history of the race declare with the Bible that man is a fallen being. And now into this human kingdom fallen from his first estate Jesus Christ came, by the act of incarnation bringing redeeming life and grace and at the same time establishing in the very bosom of humanity the kingdom of God, or of heaven. This life, this power and authority is foreign to the earth.

---

* Oken says, "Organism is galvanism residing in a thoroughly homogeneous mass. A galvanic pile pounded into atoms must become alive again. In this way nature brings forth organic bodies."

How finely this idea is illustrated in Prof. Schleiden's Book, "The Plant, a Biography." He says, "One morning I entered the room of a madman whose constantly varying hallucinations especially interested me. I found him crouching down by the stove watching with close attention a saucepan, the contents of which he was carefully stirring. At the noise of my entrance he turned round, and with a look of the greatest importance whispered, 'Hush, don't disturb my little pigs, they will be ready soon. You see,' said he, with the mysterious air of an alchemist, 'here I have black pudding, pigs' bones and bristles in the saucepan, everything that is necessary, we want only the vital warmth and the young pigs will be ready made again.'"

This new kingdom came into the world according to the order previously established in the bringing in of all the successive kingdoms of nature. This new kingdom grew not from nature up, but came in the person of Jesus Christ, the germ of the heavenly and the eternal life down from the spiritual world, taking upon Himself our nature, Himself the Godman, and thus established the Divine human kingdom of His Holy Church, of which He is the Head and Life.

And even the very mysteries that hang around this New Kingdom are in accordance strictly with the previous order of nature. There are many things in these lower orders that we cannot understand, while the higher is in no single instance comprehended by the lower. The lifeless mineral kingdom can never understand the vegetable that grows in its bosom and derives nearly all its nourishment from it. It can only receive it, and be by it in part absorbed and assimilated, so that portions of it are changed into living sap and wood, and thus animated and glorified. The same is the case with the vegetable kingdom in reference to the animal, and again with this latter in reference to the human kingdom. And thus also in strict accordance with the law previously laid down, the heavenly kingdom is a mystery to the human kingdom.

The vegetable kingdom is an insolvable mystery to the mineral kingdom, yet to man it is intelligible enough. So also may the Divine kingdom be perfectly perspicuous to higher orders of intelligences. And even we who now see in part may by growth in intelligence and spirituality, eventually understand the mysteries of this kingdom ; for we shall know even as we are known. In worldly and spiritual matters, we who live now know much more than the ancients. And they still alive in the other world (and with whose old knowledge for stepping-stones, we have risen to our present attainments) know all now that we know, and most likely much more. And *we* learn gradually even now, for that of which we are ignorant as children, we may discover as youths, but often understand only as old men, and occasionally not even then. And as there are some things reserved for our learning on the brink of the grave, so there are no doubt many things reserved for our heavenly study.

For knowing that man would fall, God planned the entire course of nature in such a way as to make redemption, or the establishment of His Kingdom in the world, possible. The whole system of nature is so constituted, as not to interfere but rather facilitate the extension of this first, though latest revealed kingdom. For earthquakes, tempests, freshets, famines, pestilence; in fact all disorders exhibit, enforce and express the curse of sin resting upon nature on account of the disobedience of man, its head and king. "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." Unconscious nature thus sympathizes with man in his fall and ruin, and is represented as groaning beneath the burden of the curse, and uttering its lay-prayer for the restoration of man, its prophet, priest and king, that it may itself be renewed and purified in and with him. For Satan in procuring man's fall by disobedience to God, established his own kingdom in and over the world. Jesus now, in working out man's redemption from the thraldom of Satan, re-establishes the kingdom of God on a deeper and surer basis than ever before. And thus is the mystery of man's fall, through the instigation of the devil, solved by the greater mystery of his redemption, through the seed of the woman as the conqueror of Satan and renewer of man. When we reflect that man was made in such a way as to be capable of redemption from his fall, and the entire course of nature renewable from the curse of sin, we can truly say, that all nature was made upon the idea of redemption. God's varied works are all formed, and introduced and carried forward upon the same plan; for the idea, and purpose, and work of redemption and glorification underlies them all, and so they shadow forth the Great Redemption by the God-man.

For the germinal life of the plant (a seed) comes to the soil in a mineral or earthly body, which must turn to common earth, that it may develop its life in a new and more extensive body. In doing this it absorbs with its roots the inanimate matter of the earth, takes it up into itself, energizing, changing, animating and converting it into living sap and wood. Thus is the mineral kingdom ennobled, lifted up into a higher sphere—redeemed to a certain extent from its low estate in which it was made. In itself, it is lifeless, but it lives in the plant, blooms in its flower, and ripens in the luscious fruit. Here certainly is a shadow of redemption. The barren earth becomes fruitful in the vegetable—the bare earth is clothed and adorned by the green grass sparkling with diamond dew, and perfumed with exhalations from myriads of blooming flowers, and so made a glorious bride, led blushingly forth to her marriage with the animal creation. The animal kingdom takes up the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, and converts portions of them into living bone, or into sensate flesh, blood and nerves. In it nature attains or rises up to sensation and locomotion. Here is also a lifting or raising up of the lower by the higher. Man subsisting upon all beneath him assimilates it, and builds a body which is a part of his person, and so elevates all and glorifies, and crowns it in himself, its self-conscious king. He certainly redeems it in a sense, and was in his pristine state to "replenish and subdue," and rule over it. Solid fluids, gases, minerals, vegetables and animals are in man, personally united with mind and spirit, and so certainly redeemed and glorified.

It seems to us that this regular order of progression, from the lower to the higher in nature, every higher being supernatural to the lower, so created in succeeding epochs, stretching in a regular chain interlinking from matter in the mineral—to the spiritual in man—that this order points beyond itself. And as the lowest kingdom consists of insensate matter alone, from which the scale of being rises gradually up to man; so there seems to be a demand for a purely spiritual kingdom. Beings of pure spirit seem to be needed to complete the chain. The Scriptures tell us that there are such, the angels or messengers. These we cannot see, for they are spiritual, and our senses are physical. And these pure spirits may call themselves natural. To them the kingdom of God in its state of glory to which they belong, may be natural. And if they call themselves natural as is highly probable; then are creation and nature synonyms. Then would nature as creation embrace all, but God Himself—supernatural, Angels are to us, (even as we are to the animals) for their nature is a manifestation of Divine power superior to ours—but still for all this, they are in themselves natural. In this way we can see how various nature is. And how the terms nature and supernatural are variously applied. How nature becomes more extensive as it is viewed by higher intelligences. And how that which from one stand-point, must be pronounced supernatural, yet regarded from another is simply a higher form of the natural. Thus while we are supernatural to the three kingdoms of nature below us, and the angels are supernatural to us—they regard themselves and us with all below us strictly natural. But though this view of the case enlarges the scope of the natural—it does not diminish that of the supernatural, for that which is truly supernatural is infinite, and the infinite can neither be increased nor decreased.

The same idea also holds true when we consider nature in relation to grace. In a sense all creation is a gracious work. God for His own sake and pleasure created all things. He created gratuitously not that He needed it—while of merit, we cannot speak concerning the uncreated—because that which is not, cannot merit anything. So He created, preserved, and redeemed in Grace. Nature is thus a result of grace. But as fallen it is the object of grace to restore it. And in this sense nature and grace are and never can be synonyms, but must remain co-relatives, as matter and spirit. Nature is fallen and can never restore itself. To do this is the work of Grace. Thus is the new creation in Christ Jesus a work of grace of a higher order than was the old creation.

Before the fall, the chain extending from the lowest order of creation to the highest was perfect. The kingdoms of nature touched each other, and through man the appointed king all earth held communion with God, and all the kingdoms of nature worshiped in sweetest harmony, "for the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But man willfully separated himself from all good spiritual power above him, and so created a fearful chasm between himself and God, and disharmony between all the powers of nature below him.

To restore this more than repairing was needed—the case was beyond mending. Such a course would moreover be derogatory to God Himself, and would be contrary to the order of nature as presented above. The case was also beyond teaching—for the fall was not so much intellectual as moral. Nor would a change of place avail, not even a taking into heaven, for it was not a local Fall, but one that was spiritual. The gulf was not one in space but in character, that separated man from God.

Neither would the creation of a new race answer, for if free they might also fall, and if they would not fall, this would not redeem or restore the first and lost. Neither would a union of man and angels answer, for some of the angels had fallen, and man's spirit was already angelic in its nature. Moreover angels are only creatures, "and could as such not bear the burdens of God's eternal wrath against the sins of all mankind," nor make an atonement for sin so as to deliver the race; for it would have no infinite value, but at the utmost one that would be simply personal. Neither would God's justice allow the punishment for man's sins to fall upon innocent angels, (for guilty ones could not atone for others) and angels being finite and sin an insult against the infinite, they could at best only redeem man by enduring eternal perdition themselves. This would however not be redemption, for it would only be substituting one order of beings for another, to be destroyed forever.

Neither would the manifestation of God alone answer except for condemnation. This was done at Mt. Sinai in the promulgation of the Holy Law of God, simply, however, as preparatory to redemption. The only course left was the New Creation as accomplished in the person of the God-man, Jesus Christ. In Him Divinity and humanity previously sundered by the act of sin are for ever joined together in personal union. In this way is fallen humanity lifted up into the closest relation with the Deity. And this fact of the incarnation did not terminate with the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross, but if anything, rather was perpetuated and extended in it, and the resurrection from the dead, for He arose, as God-man establishing upon earth the Kingdom of Heaven in His Divine-human Church, which is His body.

He came in a truly historical way into the world, even by birth, thus in the very bosom of humanity, coming into living, actual, personal contact with the deepest fountain of human life, sanctifying, cleansing and regenerating it, not starting an absolutely new race, but reheading the old race, becoming the Second Adam greater than the first, being made the quickening spirit. He came thus into the very bosom of humanity as Divine as His Father, God, and as human as His mother, Mary. In His person redemption, regeneration, salvation and sanctification of the race are all objectively complete. And all these are carried forward in the Divine-human organism of His Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. His Church is not human, neither is it divine, but divine-human. He did not hover over humanity in pure supernaturalism, but came taking up as the supernatural Life His abode in humanity, joining Himself really and truly with its life and progress in the sphere of nature.

And in His Church by spiritual and divine powers humanly used and applied, by the Word and Sacraments, under the benign influences of the Holy Ghost, He is mysteriously assimilating sinners to Himself. He makes, sinners dead in trespasses and sin, living saints, the slaves of Satan freemen of the Lord, true children of God. He thus quickens every member of the race who yields himself entirely into His power under the wooing influences of His grace. He, so to speak, takes them up into Himself and gives them His own divine-human and holy life and so quickens and cleanses them. Just as the tree rooted and grounded in the earth will by its roots absorb mineral matter and moisture, and assimilate them to itself, imparting to them its own nature and life, redeeming them. Thus the vegetable kingdom in its long sway takes up nearly the whole earth into union with itself. It can even be said to be vegetable life and powers with mineral matter organically united. So the Church is the highest organism, being the union of divine grace, power and life with human nature in its weak, sinful and dying condition, regenerating and sanctifying it, nay even glorifying it in the resurrection at the last day.

And so Christianity, the Divine Kingdom, is propagating itself, not in a human way only, nor in a purely divine way. Vegetation does not propagate itself over the earth, nor under the earth. It does not become earthly, neither does the earth become vegetable. But the vegetable kingdom lives and grows in the ground, in the soil, and thus lifts it up. So Christianity propagates itself in the very bosom of humanity in a truly natural way of its own. It does not raise humanity up into divinity, or merge divinity into humanity, nor mix it, but unite them organically, so that every child of God can say, (retaining his individuality and personality,) "I live yet not I, but Jesus Christ liveth in me." "We in Him" in the organism of His Church, and "He in us" pervading and sanctifying us by His blessed and holy life.

Thus we see how Christianity, the religion of the God-man is natural. In its advent it agrees fully with the order established by nature, coming into nature from above, from outside.

In its working it is redemption. We have seen how each higher kingdom took up into itself the lower; ennobling, exalting and glorifying it, nay, and perfecting it, thus in a sense redeeming it by assimilation, and imparting—to particles thereof (at least) its own nature. Christianity does this in a higher order and to a more perfect degree.

We have seen how each higher kingdom is supernatural to the lower, and hence also an insolvable mystery to it. So that Christianity, the religion from God, still agrees with this course of nature, in being supernatural and incomprehensible to man.

And so also is it natural in moving forward in the very bosom of that kingdom through which it came into the world, establishing as a new creative principle and life of sanctifying power a new kingdom that is foreign to the world, and which will, in the course of time, become as universal upon earth as any other: and being the highest and first of all, will rightly be eventually supreme.

So also is it natural in its growing so gradually and in a way peculiarly its own, differing from all other kingdoms, both those below man and human kingdoms established upon earth, such as governments. And naturally enough like all kingdoms it has a King great, good and glorious.

Christianity corresponds also with the general course of nature in having gradually dropped its extraordinarily miraculous exhibitions, after its proper establishment in the world. In itself it is still the standing miracle challenging our faith, the grand supersensuous mystery supernatural to man in his fallen state, yet working wonderfully in this very fallen nature; the proper continuation of the great mystery of the Incarnation from which the Church develops as the oak does from the acorn. In this sense or view the Church can never become natural as sinking into nature. But as God does not create immediately, but has laid the power of propagation into each kingdom of nature, so also does God not now immediately and in any externally miraculous way call men to Himself or regenerate them. These powers He has lodged in the organization of His Divine-human Church. As Christ's mystical body she possesses inhering life powers to propagate herself, like every natural kingdom, in a way peculiar to herself. Jesus Christ is not carnally born in every believer as He was at the first of His virgin mother. Every Christian is now spiritually born in the Church, the mother of us all, in whose mystical womb we became partakers of the Divine-human Saviour, who, as He assimilates us to His body, He imparts to us His own life. The Holy Ghost is not poured out miraculously as at the first. But abiding in the Church, He pervades every member in true communion with her as the body of Christ.

Internally, in the organization of the Church, God works as miraculously and supernaturally as ever. But it is a matter of fact that externally no such miracles are wrought by the servants of the Church, as Christ and the Apostles wrought in the beginning, curing the sick and raising the dead. And in having dropped these external miraculous exhibitions, Christianity has conformed to the general order of nature as heretofore pointed out. The continuation differs necessarily from the beginning.

In conclusion. All nature being formed with the idea, purpose and actual work of redemption underlying it, each higher, ennobling and glorifying nature, not as fallen, but as made low, leads us to conclude, that the incarnation did not depend upon the fall of man. Much rather does the whole order of nature show that He would have become incarnate, so as to properly head, ennoble and glorify humanity. We cannot conceive that all nature from the lowest to the highest order should have been constructed upon such a redemptive plan as it was, when the incarnation and consequent glorification of man could only be such an after-thought of God, depending upon a false step or act of the creature. These types and shadows of redemption in the lower kingdoms of nature would certainly have been fulfilled had man not fallen.

But however adopted or planned, the incarnation is great and glorious, being full of goodness, mercy, love and truth. Oh, that all might yield to its holy, gentle influence, as exerted by the Church. Lord hasten the day when the Messiah, Prince of Life, and King of Glory, all knees bending, all hearts paying homage before Him, all tongues confessing and praising Him as the Lord God blessed for evermore, shall walk among the nations; that His Church then embracing the world sanctified, may, under His benign rule, keep glorious jubilee and worship Him world without end.

ART. IV.—THE MISSION OF PHILOSOPHY.

BY ALEXANDER HARRIS, LANCASTER, PA.

RELIGION being a part of man's nature, the untutored savage is wont to feel and recognize God in the surrounding compass of nature. He experiences in his own inner being a feeling of dependence upon some superior essence; and at once he begins to inquire what this is, and where located. The sun and the stars being inaccessible to him, he attaches superior importance to these, and afterwards pays them the homage of his adoration. Myriads of other objects come in for recognition, as the habitations of the superior power which the uneducated man feels has an existence, but of which he has nought save conscious knowledge. The multitude of deities worshiped by the early Greeks in the days of Hesiod, we learn, from the writings of the poet himself, to have numbered thirty thousand; and so multitudinous were the objects of worship at a later period in the eternal city, that one was induced sarcastically to remark that in Rome the gods even surpassed the men in numbers.

The condition of man, at the period of which we speak, was of the most degrading character; superstition as an incubus weighed upon all his mental aspirations, and the gloomiest forebodings were part and parcel of his daily being. The philosophic lumination of ages that came to the rescue and broke the manacles of mythic imposture can in no sense be characterized but as an illumination of divine resplendence sent from the throne of the eternal, ever-existing mind, which has created and governs for the best all individual existence. The first grand achievement of philosophy, therefore, was *its education of the ancient intellect up to an approximate knowledge of the true God, and its preparation for the reception of the true faith.*

The method of the ancient philosophers, in dividing their instruction into an esoteric and an exoteric kind, was required in order to meet the adaptabilities of mankind. In the infancy of the race nothing save the mythologic creeds of an early superstition, in which were portrayed the vengeance of the gods upon the iniquities of a Tantalus and an Ixion, would have served to repress the passions and injustice of men and nations. The philosophic mind could laugh at the follies of the popular faith, but dare not impart to the illiterate the truths of a higher comprehension, as they were incapable of receiving them. Homer himself, the earliest of the Greek poets, is believed to have seen the truths of a purer theology, although the whole scope of his matchless poems rests upon the fictitious conceptions of mythic fancy. So at least is the master poet of antiquity interpreted by St. Cyril of Alexandria. The feuds of the Olympian deities, the guiles and deceptions of the king of gods and men, and the boisterous rage of Juno were but portraitures of the untutored Grecian fancy; but within the chambers of his own breast the inimitable author of the Iliad worshiped the one uncreated God, who was the first of all beings. The Orphic fragments also give early attestation of the belief of the educated mind of Greece in the existence of one unmade deity, the original of all things. And although Orpheus names this self-existent deity Jupiter, it is by no means to be inferred that he attaches to him simply the ideas usually attributed to the mythologic god of this name, the son of Saturn; for he expressly names attributes due only to the uncreated ruler of the universe. At these early periods it is to be expected that the ideas of the most acute reasoners and philosophers would be very crude and unsettled. But the philosophic spirit of inquiry and reflection had already begun its work, and it remained for the following schools of Greek thought to make further advances.

From an apothegm of Thales, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, that "God is the oldest of all things," it may be inferred that the founder of the Ionic school of philosophy believed in one uncreated God. His contemporary, Pherecydes Syrus, seems to have entertained the same opinion. In the golden verses of the founder of the Italic school and in the fragments of Ocellus Lucanus, it is clearly gathered that Pythagoras believed in one supreme deity, although also speaking of inferior. His principal god, however, contained the whole of the subordinate ones. Thus was the common notion of the illiterate Pagans as to a multiplicity of deities exploded in the estimation of these philosophers, and of those who followed them. Xenophanes, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Parmenides and Empedocles are all upon record as accepting, in one form or other, of the unity of the godhead. Antisthenes, the head of the Cynic sect, declared that "although different nations and cities had objects of worship of their own deification; yet for all that but one God existed."

Up to the period of Socrates, the Grecian mind seemed as it were groping in a night of almost Egyptian darkness; but with the advent of this sage clearer rays of philosophic light burst upon the horizon of the thinking world. Besides attaining to a more accurate conception of one God, the creator of the universe, Socrates was the first, as Cicero avers, who drew philosophy from heaven and domesticated it in the habitations of men. Of this light of his race, Tertullian writes as follows: "Propterea damnatus est Socrates, quia Deos destruebat," i. e., that he suffered death from his preaching up a knowledge of one God. In his discourse with Aristodemus, quoted by Xenophon, Socrates convinced him that the things of the world were not the production of chance, but the work of intellect and design. He also endeavored to convince him that our mind and understanding was derived from a vastly superior and transcendant mind, existing somewhere in the universe; and although this was invisible, nevertheless it must in all reason be accepted. "Is not," argued he, with his doubting friend, "your own soul, which rules over your body invisible, and by parity of reasoning might you infer that you do nothing by mind and understanding, but all by chance, as well as to conclude that all things in the world are done without a ruler?" And notwithstanding the clear attestation of Socrates to a belief in one supreme and universal numen, it is still clear that he by no means rejected all the inferior gods of the Pagan system, as has been by some conceived. That this is so, is apparent from his last dying mandate to his philosophic friend, Crito, after he had swallowed the fatal draught, that he should not fail to offer a votive cock for him to Æsculapius. The last words of the expiring philosopher may indicate this, however, that notwithstanding his reason had triumphed over the superstitions of his childhood and youth, *in articulo mortis*, they again overpowered him.

But it was in the ruminations of Plato that the Grecian mind attained to the clearest conception of one uncreated and self-existing deity, who was the creator of the whole universe, as also of the subordinate and inferior gods. That many of the latter existed, as he believed, his writings fully attest. No further illumination was made by the reasoning mind of Greece over that exhibited in the writings of Plato as to the unity of the godhead, and indeed most of the subsequent philosophic attempts served but to mystify what this divine thinker had presented. We do not, however, see in this philosopher the amplest presentation of the unity; but in him first is caught the clearest glimmer of a triune hypostasis of quasi personages in the Godhead which prepared the minds of the heathen philosophers of after ages for the reception of the trinity of revelation. That Plato accepted such a trinity, the following from Cudworth is cited—*Intellectual System*, vol. 2, pp. 300–301: "Though some have suspected that trinity, which is commonly called Platonic, to have been nothing but a mere figment and invention of some later Platonists, yet the contrary hereunto seems to be unquestionably evident that Plato himself really asserted such a trinity of universal and divine hypostases, which have the nature of principles. For, first, whereas, in his tenth book of Laws he professedly opposing Atheists, undertakes to prove the existence of a deity, he does notwithstanding there ascend no higher than to the Psyche, or universal mundane soul, as a self-moving principle, and the immediate or proper cause of all that motion which is in the world. And this is all the god that there he undertakes to prove. But in other places of his writings he frequently asserts above the self-moving Psyche an immovable and standing Nous, or intellect, which was properly the Demiurgus, or architectonic framer of the whole world. And lastly, above this multiform intellect, he plainly asserts yet a higher hypostasis, one most simple and most absolutely perfect being which he calls *τὸ ἓν*, in opposition to that multiplicity, which speaks something of imperfection in it, and *τ' ἀγαθὸν*, goodness itself, as being above mind and understanding, the first intelligible, and an infinite fecundity, together with overflowing benignity. And accordingly in his second epistle to Dionysius does he mention a trinity of divine hypostases all together."

But it was long afterwards in the pondering conceptions of Philo, a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, who was profoundly versed in Academic lore, that the hypostatic trinity of Plato first came into manifest and clear personification. This necessarily supposes many intermediate stages of mental development between the head of the Academy of Athens and the philosophic cotemporary of the man of Galilee, all of which are now buried in the oblivious gloom of past ages. Philo in his thinking represents the developed consciousness of Pagan and Jewish philosophy, and portrays the intensified need of that revelation, which although to the philosopher unknown, had actually taken place. Greek philosophy had performed its part of preparation in the world's education. The fullness of time had come, and the Divine herald was proclaiming the truths of revelation. The educated world is in a condition to comprehend what otherwise would have been inexplicable. Herein then is, in one aspect, the mission of philosophy illustrated.

Another mission of philosophy was the establishment of correct moral maxims for the regulation of men and nations. As with Socrates clearer notions came to be entertained concerning the first cause of all existence; so with this philosopher likewise ethics began to be one of the subjects of men's meditations. From his time, therefore, moral philosophy was cultivated. This branch of human thought was not like the metaphysical speculations concerning the Deity confined to the followers of Plato; but even the other philosophical schools vied with each other, and the most orthodox in the enunciations of maxims for the government of life. Besides the Academics, the followers of Epicurus and the Stoics were great advocates for correct principles of morals. This serves as evidence to confirm the belief that the maxims of morality are based upon the immutable principles of right and wrong existent in the nature of man and the whole economy of creation. Upon what other assumption can the ethical system of Stoicism be supposed to rest? In a system in which death was proclaimed as an eternal sleep it would seem as altogether unreasonable to expect a pure system of morality. And yet such do we find in this school of philosophy. Of this sect of philosophers Montesquieu speaks as follows: "Of all the sects of philosophers among the ancients, there was none whose principles were more worthy of man, or better fitted to make men good, than that of the Stoics."

The divine lesson implanted in the mind of man by his Creator was in all these cases an unconscious guide as it were in elevating and moralizing the human race and educating it so as to be fitted for the reception of that more perfect morality yet to come. The heathen moralists and others were right when they estimated philosophy for its great usefulness in instructing and directing mankind and healing the distempers of the mind. Plato, Tully, Seneca, and Plutarch all esteemed law as the product of right reason, and consequently the will of God. Cicero uses this language: "God, the Common Master and Lord of all, is the Inventor, the propounder and the Creator of law." Indeed the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Antoninus present a sublime ethical standard rivalling in the estimation of many pious and learned men the pure morality of revelation. The erudite Meric Casaubon, in his preface to his translation of Antoninus's Meditations, expresses himself thus: "I must needs say, that if we esteem that natural, which natural men of best account, by the mere strength of human reason, have taught, and taken upon them to maintain as just and reasonable, I know not any evangelical precept or duty, belonging to a Christian's practice (even the harshest, and those that seem to ordinary men the most contrary to flesh and blood not excepted) but upon due search and examination will prove of that nature."

That a higher ideal of ethical purity was steadily building itself up in human consciousness seems evident; as a great difference is discernible between the moral standards of the earlier and later philosophic schools. Every reader of history is aware that the heathen systems of Neo-Platonism and Stoicism that for ages ran counter and along-side of Christianity exhibited in their teaching the most amiable principles and moral maxims that to the unlettered might appear as if filched from the Divine system then spreading itself throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire. Such for ages was the opinion of most writers, but this is now clearly disproved in the developments of modern criticism. The God-illumined reason of man was therefore simply performing its part in the education of the world, and preparing for the conversion of the nations which entered the Church of the Redeemer in the early ages of its history.

The dissipation of the myths of antiquity was also accomplished by philosophy. The early races of the world having no other conceptions than those derived from objects of sense, deified these and paid them their adoration. Hence arose the infinite number of the ancient gods and goddesses. The contemplation of the surrounding universe could not but serve to suggest to the most illiterate the existence of some being superior to themselves. He must however be in their opinion some mighty corporeal creature who had his throne upon a lofty elevation to which none but powers like himself were admitted. Jupiter seated upon the pinnacle of Olympus was far from the earliest belief of the human mind concerning the ruler of the skies. This king of gods and men was himself born as human beings, and descended from an ancestry arising out of chaos. Ages of reflection no doubt preceded even this crude conception of deity; and many more were required to evolve the more pure Platonic ideas of the unmade and self-existing Creator of the universe. All this was the work of the philosophic mind. With the establishment of the various philosophical schools superstition and imposture were compelled to retire into the background; and the classic age of Cicero and Horace saw the educated classes of Greece and Rome a unit in their disbelief of the early fables of their fathers. All these were in popular acceptation atheists, but veritably real theists, capable of understanding genuine truth and fitted for its reception when presented. As long as they had remained attached to the early fables, they would have been incapable of receiving a revelation of truth as the same was vouchsafed to be given.

The rounding and solidification of revelation into a true Christian edifice was another work of philosophy deserving of some attention. This task was devolved upon the Greek Christians of Alexandria, headed by Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen. These intellectual giants were profoundly versed in the truths of Evangelical knowledge, and were also sailing in the most advanced currents of speculative philosophy. The manifold heresies that arose in the bosom of the early Church and distracted it were in a great measure influenced by the skeptical spirit of the age, which had been engendered in the old schools of Platonism, Stoicism, and Pyrrhonism. To combat these a knowledge of philosophy was required, and this alone was found in the Greek school of Christians, which sent forth the renowned leaders of the early Church that aided in the overthrow of the Pagan hosts and their enrollment as soldiers of Christ. The Latin Church from the first steadily set its face against the metaphysical systems of the Greek schools of thought, characterizing them all as the work of Satan, and hence Tertullian, the ablest and most renowned of these early leaders, eschewing the aid of philosophy was unable to endure the heretical assaults of Montanism, which for a period overspread with desolating ruin the faith of the ancient Church. But as dominant Rome accepted all her philosophy from subjugated Greece, so the imperious Latin fathers, though unconscious thereof, became subordinate workmen in the erection of the great edifice of the Christian Church. They also received the instruments of their workmanship from the Greek masters of Alexandria, who were alone competent to supervise and polish the magnificent temple as it arose. The arms by which Gnosticism, Manichæism and other similar heresies were battled and overthrown came from the armory of the Alexandrian fathers; and none but these were competent to propound and establish to faith-acceptation the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity as the Nicene Council accepted it. The perfecting process of the Greek mind still aided in the establishment of the Church until the days of St. Augustine, who crowned the mighty edifice by the power of his far-reaching logic and deep penetration. The great structure thus completed by this Achilles of the Latin fathers was the Church, which bore omnipotent sway during the whole period of the middle ages, and which in one form may be said to remain unshattered up to the present epoch.

But it was with the borrowed implements of the Grecian metaphysics, that had been transmitted by Philo, Clement, and Origen, that Augustine was enabled to perfect the great work of his aspirations; and so soon as the undertaking was completed and these were laid aside, as Latin dictation demanded, a long night of darkness followed. The rulers of the new edifice, still cherishing the old conceptions of their ancestors that philosophy was allied to the black arts, caused the imperial mandate of a Justinian, who ordered all the philosophical schools of his dominions to be closed for ever. Reason retired to the silent haunts of obscurity and the gloom of mediæval superstition and ignorance, for long successive ages, covered the world of intellect; and which was made the more sensible by the flickering lights of a few thoughtful monks that shone from their solitary monasteries. It was the gloom of scholasticism. The Church calling itself Catholic now reigned supreme.

Philosophy again procreated the influences that germinated in the Protestant reform. From the period that the Church reigned omnipotent, but weak opposition was made to its authority until the revival of letters opened the flood-gates of free inquiry, never again to be closed. During all the period of the dark ages a slumbering opposition, as it were, existed towards the arbitrary authority of the Church upon the part of the human mind. Now and then a spirit of more than ordinary intellectual vigor rising up and asserting the potency of reason and in turn calling down upon itself the ban of ecclesiastical authority, which for a time silenced the temerarious inquirer either by a recantation or in the flames of an *auto da fe.*

Philosophy, the product of human reason, when banished by Justinian from the Grecian schools was compelled to wander in exile for some centuries, until at last it was permitted to become the servant of its Christian master in the schools of Charlemagne and under the supervision of St. Alcuin. It could study antiquity, read the beautiful master-pieces of Greece and Rome, and philosophize within the race of authority; but death to the rash spirit that dared to transcend its bounds. Such was scholasticism; and such the vaunted philosophy of the schools of the middle ages. The inquirer might reason according to the dialectics of Aristotle so long as he did not thereby violate any of the decisions of the Church. Should an Anselm or a Thomas Aquinas go beyond the accustomed range of thought in his metaphysical ruminations, he could obtain canonization, because no other in his age was sufficiently acute to probe his researches. Fortunate philosopher he; for had some equally adroit dialectician come across his path, the war would have been terrific; and instead of the philosopher being honored as the *angel of the school*, and applauded by all his auditors, he might have been compelled to succumb beneath the shades of a monastery and under the frown of ecclesiastical displeasure. The dexterous opponent of William de Champeau, who was able to attract his thousands of auditors from all parts of the civilized world and establish himself as the great metaphysician of his century, sailed too far into the channel of free thought that was beginning already to show signs of a rising flood. Abelard was too free an investigator to merit renown in the Church whose main pillar was authority; he was of too Protestant a spirit.

The night of obedience to absolute church authority was fast passing away. The morning of free inquiry was approaching. We seem to descry in Duns Scotus and John of Occam harbingers of the approaching dawn. Into the Thomists and Scottists of the anti-revival period the Catholic world becomes divided. Research is fostered more and more, and the light of philosophy grows steadily brighter. The aurora of the new epoch advances; morning dawns, and the warriors arise and arm themselves for the impending struggle with scholasticism. The sun of free inquiry rises above the horizon. Philosophy begins the battle for its manumission from its masters, and cohabilitates itself in its ancient regalia. The Reformation with all its consequences was but the result of the re-enthronement of free inquiry and philosophical research. Luther and his reforming compeers must of necessity rise and lead the army of reason, or others will take their places. The work of the Reformation, or by whatever name it might be called, was inevitable; it was not the work of the German monk and his coadjutors, but of the age in which they lived. After the discovery of printing it became a necessity. It is true at first it might have been crushed out for a century, or even longer, as it was in some places before Luther's day, and as afterwards took place in Italy, Spain and France. But it must come at last. Like a swelling torrent it might have been checked as by a dam for a period, but in the end all opposition must give way, and the flood be permitted to take its course. Its progress is onward. It has been from the first up till the present steadily shearing the Catholic hierarchy of its power, and to what it will yet reduce it the future alone can tell. The strong Catholic citadel long and valiantly defended, the temporal power of the Holy See, has at length given way, and little doubt but forever.

It was a mighty force indeed that gave birth to the numerous churches and ecclesiastical organizations of the Reformation period; and one whose strength must ever increase with the onward march of time. If the indwelling force of free philosophical inquiry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was sufficient to resist the shock of the united arguments and armies of the Catholic world, and was able to plant Protestantism in Europe, in the face of the terrific opposition it encountered; by what measure are we now to estimate its present strength and magnitude? What obstacle could we conceive now sufficient to resist its onward progress? It seems indeed marked as the force that is to carry forward the destiny of our race.

After the establishment of the Reformation the task devolved upon philosophy to establish enlightened principles of biblical interpretation. With the dissemination of books that followed the discovery of printing, a mental activity soon spread over Europe that the world had not before witnessed. Men began to think and reason upon all questions then forming the curriculum of study, and theology amongst the rest came in for its share of investigation. By the reformers the great principle asserted, was the right of individual inquiry in opposition to absolute church authority. They, however, did not absolve themselves entirely from all authority. Instead of the authority of the Church, they made the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the unqualified rule of their faith. These being now accepted by them as the absolute standard of authority, to the same their followers were implicitly required to subscribe. The principle of individual inquiry being once admitted, if the Reformers had the right to set up one standard of authority in opposition to the Catholic Church, then their followers were equally free to establish a different one. So long as this latter assumption was denied, the scholastic spirit remained unconquered. And such was indeed the fact. The reformers, though unconscious, were, whilst opposing scholasticism, themselves scholastic, and it remained as the task of the Christian philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to erect free philosophical inquiry upon its ancient pedestal and accord it that position in investigation to which it is entitled.

The reformers made simply one advance towards the attainment of truth. Philosophy made another equally as important. This last was taken by Descartes, who must ever be regarded as the father of the modern mode of thinking. He set out by declaring that for the correct acquisition of truth, we must begin by first doubting everything. Bacon, Galileo, Leibnitz and all the eminent modern philosophers in general, have *followed* this method. Copernicus and Galileo in their investigations as to the theory of the heavenly bodies, did not stop to inquire whether their deductions might conflict with any accepted theological dicta; it was sufficient for them to inquire if the correct laws of reasoning did not require of them new theories of astronomical revolution. The doctors of the church in vain raised their voices against the truths of philosophy that were one after another promulgated. The tide of investigation had set in, and a modification of the stern aspect of the ancient creeds was demanded in order to bring them into harmony with the unerring laws of reason. God's divine will and the history of His creation was imprinted upon all the works of His hand, and the book of His dictation must be found in unison with the impress of His writing upon the face of the universe. This harmony, the development and advance of modern science and philosophical research have shown; and the sublime beauty and conformity in the same are now to the scientific eye apparent in the word of divine truth, interpreted in the commentaries of universal nature. As thus seen, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are no longer in conflict with enlightened reason, and everything which seems so, in the estimation of the ablest and most sincere theologians of the present age, is as yet but imperfectly understood.

The enlightenment and liberalization of opinion has been effected by the advance of philosophy. Glance at the state of sentiment that reigned in Europe at the period when Luther and his followers began the great work of their reform. The shock of innovation that so almost instantaneously, as it were, burst upon the general vision of the Catholic world, aroused the ancient church to the necessity of exerting all its vigor and power in order to repress the new and threatening ideas of the age. The repression of all antagonistic opinions, by every means within reach, was resorted to by the dominant ecclesiastical organism. The means made use of were the same as had often been employed on former occasions; but the church now seemed to find itself necessitated to use more frequent and strenuous exertion of the same instrumentalities that had crushed out Arianism; and had also repressed the Waldensian and other similar heresies. John Huss and Jerome of Prague who sank in the fires of Constance, were victims to the intolerant spirit of an unphilosophic age; and these two noble proto-martyrs must ever stand upon the records of time, as having greatly contributed in giving impetus to the movement of free inquiry, then preparing the reformation epoch. Again see illustrated the spirit of intolerance in the flames of Smithfield, the inquisitorial fires of Spain and Italy, and in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The same was it, which excited the civil wars of France, with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and its consequent national calamities; which drenched the Netherlands in the blood of its noblest citizens; and which inflamed the bloody and intestine carnage of the desolating thirty years' war of Germany. The Genevan reformer himself, although ranging himself in opposition to the dogmatism of absolute authority, had not yet caught the spirit of toleration which subsequent ages accepted as the boon of philosophical liberty. This, the flames in which Servetus expired, fully attest. Sect stands arrayed against Sect, with menacing looks of wrath, and it becomes the task of philosophy to disarm the contestants. This sovereign of the mind stepped forth in the writings of Montaigne, Spinoza, Bayle and their followers, and proclaimed a cessation of hostilities between the contending religious organizations, and henceforth toleration of opinion reared its head first in Holland, and afterwards in other parts of Europe.

Much as philosophical speculation has been derided and condemned, it has its part to perform on the arena of the world's progress; yea even those whose reputations stand blackened in the flames of the French revolution, performed worthy service in the hands of a higher destiny, in securing for universal humanity the right of free speech and the toleration of free opinion. The warring theologians might have still continued the strife against each other had not the spirit of philosophy interposed. As long as the doctrine, *ex ecclesia* *nulla salus*, was maintained, no other result could be expected. When this was made to yield to a more enlightened and reasonable belief, the strife ceased. Sincerity of any honest opinion, as equally worthy, took its place, and liberty spread its wings over the world's wide domain.

One of the grand results of philosophical research has been the banishment of the myths and superstitions of past ages. The belief in sorcery and witchcraft was a superstition that bore for long centuries of duration tyrannic sway over the minds of all classes of mankind, and volumes of history swell with the narrations of the multitudes of innocent beings whose lives fell sacrifices upon the altars of deluded opinions. The parliamentary bodies of Paris, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Rheims, Rouen, Dijon and Rennes enacted laws for the suppression of magic and witchcraft within their dominions; and the pallid reaper of death that followed these decrees, crimsoned the streets and lanes of many a city and hamlet, and spread desolation and horror broadcast throughout the land. It is melancholy to remember that well-intentioned and upright judges, after days spent in sifting the evidence adduced before them, could sentence the innocent but convicted magician, with the same conscientious gravity, as would Lord Mansfield the blood-stained murderer. For these imaginary crimes, the existence of which the intelligence of the nineteenth century denies, seven thousand victims are said to have been burned at Treves, six hundred by a single bishop of Bamberg, and eight hundred in a single year in the bishopric of Wurtzburg. At Toulouse, where the inquisition had its seat, four hundred were executed for sorcery at one time, and fifty in the city of Douay in a single year. The executions which took place in the city of Paris in a few months were, in the expressive language of an old chronicler, "Almost infinite." The credulity which sanctioned the executions for these crimes was not confined to one country or people; for the Inquisition of Spain ended the career of many Parisian refugees who sought in flight safety in the sister country. In this delusion-ridden land the persecution spread to the smallest towns and villages, and so inveterate was the popular superstition that a sorcerer was burned so late as the year 1780. Torquemada lent his energies as zealously to the extirpation of witchcraft as to that of heresy, and even wrote a book upon the enormity of the crime. The examples thus far enumerated indicate the attitude of the Church of Rome as regards these supposed crimes, but upon this ground the Reformers had no quarrel with their opponents. The credulity of Luther on this point was amazing even for his age. Speaking of witchcraft the Wittemberg Reformer uses the following emphatic and unhesitating language: "I would have no compassion on these witches," exclaimed he. "I would burn them all." In England the Reformation was the signal for the immediate outburst of the superstition; and there as elsewhere its decline was represented by a fanatical clergy as the consequence of increasing skepticism. In Scotland, where the reformed clergy exercised unbounded influence, the witch trials were very numerous, and the persecution remarkably atrocious. The ablest defender of the belief in witches probably was Glanvil, a clergyman of the Episcopal Church; and one of the most influential was the Puritan, Baxter. Puritanism imported the belief into the new world; and the executions in Massachusetts form one of the darkest pages of our occidental history. Even the distinguished founder of Methodism stands enrolled as one of the latest believers in the exploded superstition. All these superstitions, with other kindred notions, the intellect of the age, enlightened by the developments of science, and the metaphysical illuminations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has cast aside; and he would be a bold man to-day indeed who in the face of the beaming intelligence of the present epoch would dare to express a belief in them. Equally as great a mad-man would he be regarded in intelligent estimation as he who should be found to call in question the truth of the Copernican system of the universe, or the Newtonian theory of gravitation.

But the grandest result of modern progress is the entire harmony that is come to be generally perceived by the Church between the deductions of philosophy and the truths of the Christian system. Owing to this agreement religion is found to be in no wise an exception to the general law of progress, but rather the highest form of its manifestation, and its earlier aspects but the necessary steps of an imperfect development. In this view the moral element of Christianity is as the sun in heaven, and dogmatic systems as the clouds that intercept and temper the exceeding brightness of its rays. Truth ever remains truth, but one period may more fully establish it than another. This is now seen in the general acceptance of truths once attested by but a few solitary teachers of the early Church. Christianity has no longer cause to dread the developments of science and philosophy. She, on the contrary, accepts them with triumphant alacrity, having no stereotyped standard to defend, and she regards the human mind as pursuing on the highest subjects a path of continual progress towards the fullest and most transcendent knowledge of the Deity. This conception of a continued and uninterrupted development has subsidized almost all the thinking of the age. It is stirring all science to its very depths, and is revolutionizing all historical literature. Pitiful is that school of theology indeed which is not influenced in one form or other by it. Even the Roman Catholic Church, whose fundamental basis is authority, is more or less made to yield to this dominant sentiment of the age. The rationalistic momentum of the world, itself widely divergent from the old Voltairean spirit, has but aided in bringing thought to this sublime conception, and all in the interest of liberalized Christian views. The great ideal of the Church is still coming into more distinct and clear recognition. Around it cluster the leading Christian conceptions of the period; equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the elevation of the poor, the love of truth, and the general diffusion of liberty. The enemies of the truth thus, whilst laboring to destroy it, have simply aided in making it more luminous and brilliant, and again have verified the divine saying that "the Lord maketh the wrath of man to praise Him." The progress of the Christian Church is still onward, and it is "going forth conquering and to conquer." It has opened wide its motherly arms, overthrown its enemies by their own logic, and embraces in its charitable folds its once most malignant persecutors. Their weapons, wrested from them, are now being burnished for use under the great Captain of their salvation, who is marching forth for the spiritual subjugation of the world. Persecution, for opinion's sake, is amongst the obsolete ideas of the past. The red sea of blood has been crossed; the Christian conscience, as the pillar of fire, is leading forward the race in charity, toleration and free opinion, and uniting mankind in a universal brotherhood where free thought and free speech are crowning the highest aspirations of man.

ART. V.—WOMAN'S CULTURE.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, A. M., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

We are told by travelers that, at the city of Coblentz, where the rivers Rhine and Moselle unite, the two streams seem loth to mingle, and may for miles be distinguished by the color of their waters, flowing side by side. In a somewhat similar way, there are occasions when a double stream of emotion comes in upon the soul, and when our feelings become indescribable, and are sometimes entirely beyond our control.

I am glad to be with you to-night; I rejoice to be permitted to speak words of cheer to the officers and members of an institution in which I take the deepest interest, and at a place which is to me the shrine of the fondest memories.

Yet, by the side of my rejoicing flows a little stream of sorrow, and the two currents absolutely refuse to mingle. I cannot help remembering how, twenty-three years ago, there was a somewhat similar assembly at this very spot, and how the heart of a certain boy, who then ventured for the first time "to speak in public on the stage," alternately thrilled with hope and fear. I cannot repress a feeling of sadness when I fail to recognize the familiar faces of many dear friends, who were with us then, but whom we shall nevermore behold on earth. With such fond memories the heart grows tender, and I dare not venture to dwell upon them:

---

* An Address delivered before the Young Ladies of the Allentown Female College, Allentown, Penna., on Thursday Evening, June 27, 1872. Published by request.

> "Bewegt mit Freed un Trauer—ach!
> Die Dhrene kumme wann ich lach!
> Kanscht denke wie ich fiehl." *

You will not be surprised, then, if under the influence of such conflicting emotions, my remarks this evening should at times partake more of the nature of a sermon than of that of an entertaining address. Ministers are, at any rate, so accustomed to preaching, that in their discourses on miscellaneous topics, and even in ordinary conversation, they are in great danger of falling into the didactic style of the pulpit. The celebrated Coleridge, you may remember, attempted in early life to become a minister, but having utterly failed in the pulpit, he did the next best thing, and became a great philosopher and poet. He was, however, a prodigious talker, and when on a certain occasion he inquired of the genial author of "Elia," "Lamb, did you ever hear me preach?" he received, in Lamb's peculiar, stammering style, the cutting reply, "I never heard you do *anything else*."

Having chosen to address you on "Woman's Culture," I think, if I were preaching a sermon, I would select as my text that wonderful prayer of King David, in which, after expressing his desire that "the sons may be strong, like plants grown up in their youth," he adds the enlightened petition, "that our daughters may be as corner-stones, polished after the similitude of a palace." Nowhere else in antiquity can we find the true nature and object of *Woman's Culture* so clearly stated.

---

* "Both joy and sorrow fill my heart—
E'en when I smile the tears will start—
Alas! how strange I feel!"
—Harbaugh's "*Pennsylvania German Poems.*"

When Solomon erected his magnificent temple at Jerusalem, he caused the outer porch to be supported by two great pillars, one of which was called Jachin and the other Boaz; and it has been held by some modern expositors, that they respectively signified strength and beauty, the pillars on which the Church and State depend. Man is Boaz and woman Jachin; man must perform the severest labors, while woman adds to them that polish and beauty without which they would at best be crude and incomplete.

Long, long ago, before the building of the temple of Diana at Ephesus, before the Parthenon reared its snowy crest on the heights of the Acropolis, this truth was fully acknowledged and exemplified by the architects of ancient Greece. They tell us, that the Doric column, which is plain and massive, signifies man; while the Ionic, slender and graceful as a lily-stem, represents woman, whose mission tis to prove the usefulness of the beautiful; for

"Wherever strength with beauty joins,
When with the rough the mild combines,
Then all is union, sweet and strong."

When we remember this ancient, and we may say, universal acknowledgment of the special mission of woman, and especially when we consider what she has done and is still doing for the Church and for the world—working for the most part as silently as the polypi in the depths of the ocean, and yet erecting monuments as mighty and enduring as the coral reefs themselves—is it not wonderful, that until a comparatively recent period, almost all genuine culture was denied her? Grecian and Roman history furnishes many examples of women of remarkable purity and patriotism, but the few women of talent and culture whose names are mentioned—such as Sappho and Aspasia,—were condemned, apparently for that very reason, to social ostracism. They seem to have been considered rather disreputable characters.

It was just so during the Middle Ages. We are lost in astonishment at the gigantic efforts which were put forth for the education of men; universities were established in every country in Europe, and their students were numbered by thousands. There was everywhere a raging thirst for knowledge, and such a man as Abelard had but to announce his intention of lecturing, though it were at some obscure convent in the midst of trackless forests, and almost all the young men in the country would hasten thither to hear him, though at the danger of starving in the wilderness. All honor, then, to the noble men who brought about that revival of letters of which we still enjoy the precious fruits! But what did these great scholars accomplish for the culture of woman? Alas! nothing at all. In fact, they seem to have looked upon an educated woman as a sort of monster who, like a crowing hen, deserved nothing better than to have her head wrung off.

Those were the days when a Duke of Normandy, on hearing that a certain learned lady had successfully disputed with the professors in the University of Bologna, was not ashamed to say, that he thanked God that not one of the women of his family could read or write. Is it wonderful that women under such restrictions should have produced but few works of genius? "Not more than one hundred and fifty years ago, long after the establishment of Harvard University, a Massachusetts School Committee refused to permit girls to study arithmetic and grammar after the boys had been dismissed; and a little later, a teacher in Plymouth County, in the same state, was discharged for instructing girls to cipher, on the ground that their heads were too weak to stand the strain of mathematics. Is it surprising that woman should have remained a *cypher* when men were such *vulgar fractions?*"

If any man had been bold enough to speak in favor of female education in the days to which we have referred, he would no doubt have been compelled to fight his way step by step. He would have had to prove the capacity of the female mind for culture, and the necessity of due preparation for her work, which is no less important than that of man. It would have been necessary to ransack the annals of all nations to find examples of female heroism and genius; to remind the Frenchman that to Joan of Arc he owed his national independence; to encourage the pride of the Englishman in

> "Those melodious bursts that fill
> The spacious times of great Elizabeth
> With sounds that echo still."

We live in a different age, and any attempt of the kind would be labor lost. Prejudices are passing away like the mists of morning. The days are past when educated women were sneered at, until they became the cold, stern, angular beings they were popularly supposed to be; and I am sure, if Thomas Moore were still living he would not venture to paint the ideal educated woman as

> "Mrs. Hopkins taking tea
> And toast upon the wall of China."

We have come to feel that humanity constitutes a unit which is to be found complete neither in man nor woman separately considered, but in both; and that to neglect either of its developments is to stunt and deform the race. We are assured that to attempt to civilize the world without educating the mothers of succeeding generations, is a task which, like the rolling of the rock of Sysiphus, must be constantly renewed, and yet can never be fully accomplished.

The Female Colleges, and other institutions of a similar character, that are springing up all around us, prove that we are waking up to our duties in this respect, and though we occasionally encounter some crabbed old cynic, who calls such things "nonsense," we can now afford to turn the laugh on him in the full assurance of victory. The subject before us, therefore, narrows down to the consideration of the true nature and objects of woman's culture.

We may as well say first as last, that we have not come here to advocate any system of education which is contrary to nature. In the words of a distinguished divine, "We do not desire to make trumpets out of flutes, or sun-flowers out of violets." Let the greatest sculptor in the world attempt to transform an Ionic column into a Doric, and the result will be a miserable, stumpy caricature, that will have lost its original beauty without having acquired the strength and massiveness of the object which it imitates. The culture which we advocate is of an entirely different nature, and has a very different object. Like humanity itself, it must in its original constitution be the same in both sexes, and yet in its further developments it must be true to its mission of bringing to light the peculiar powers and graces of the female mind and character.

1. In accomplishing this work we must be sure that we have laid a good foundation. If we neglect this we may, indeed, erect a structure as bright and glittering as the palace which the Empress Anne built of ice upon the frozen river Neva; but some fine day the foundations will give way, and the whole edifice will tumble into hopeless ruin. While it would be folly to deny the immense advantages of talent, beauty, wealth, and social position, in the case of those who are otherwise prepared for their mission, it would be worse than folly to make them the foundation of woman's culture. She seems, at any rate, to be in danger of attaching an undue degree of importance to things of this kind, which like the little idols which Rachel hid away when she left her father's house, are apt to prevent her from devoting herself earnestly to the service of Jehovah. The cultivation of such propensities, without having first laid a deep foundation of earnest piety, is sure to produce the most disastrous results. A serpent may be lithe and graceful, it may have beautiful eyes that sparkle like jewels, but it is a serpent still, and we shrink from it with horror. No one, I am sure, would hold up to our admiration, on account of their beauty, talent, and royal birth, such infamous personages as Messalina, Catharine de Medicis, Margaret of Valois, or Catharine II of Russia. There may be a certain fascination in reading about the career of such women, of whom there are, at any rate, enough in the world to furnish the originals of the heroines of such popular novels as East Lynne and Lady Audley's Secret; but still we would shrink from them with horror if we were to meet them personally in actual life. We all feel that,

"'Tis not the fairest form that holds
The mildest, purest soul within;
'Tis not the richest plant that folds
The sweetest breath of fragrance in."

In short, we are all, I trust, agreed, that all culture is worse than wasted, unless it is based upon a firm, unwavering faith. The woman who would grow strong for the performance of her special work, must rely firmly on the Author of her existence. She must have a heart full of the love and the life of her blessed Lord. False to all the better instincts of her nature is she who rejects her Saviour's love. As the poet says:

"Oh, what is woman, what her smile,
Her joyous heart, her eye so bright,
What is she, if her lips revile
Jesus, the Lord of life and light?
Without that meeker grace, she'll be
A lighter thing than vanity."

Only when her heart is unwaveringly fixed on the Saviour, when all the higher impulses of her nature cling to Him as the ivy to the oak, is it that Christ's strength is perfected in her weakness; that she is worthy of being compared to a cornerstone "polished after the similitude of a palace." "Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."

2. Having laid a substantial foundation, our next care must be to erect a superstructure that will be of a similar character. There is a kind of education, which is, strictly speaking, no education at all, that consists in the accumulation of miscellaneous materials, in the hope that they may possibly be of use in later life. Under this supposition the mind is crammed with a chaos of undigested facts and bits of knowledge, probably not understood and soon forgotten, and which generally constitute an effectual bar to all genuine culture. It was probably at an institution conducted in this way that a certain young lady received her "finishing" who, being asked the question at examination, "Did Dr. Luther die a natural death?" promptly responded, "No, sir; he was excommunicated by the Pope's bull."

It is not so much great learning that we desire for our daughters, as wisdom to use properly the knowledge of the things of every-day life. We do not wish their mind to be like a garret stored with useless lumber, but rather like a beautiful and well-arranged cabinet, in which every fragment of information at once finds its proper place, and is ticketed and labeled for future reference. Knowledge is everywhere—all nature is full of it. It comes tumbling in on our minds at every moment of our existence, and the problem is not how to get knowledge, but how to keep it, and how to apply it. Teach our girls how to gain and how to retain knowledge, and they will keep on learning all their lives, so that in old age their conversation and manner will possess a charm for which the belle of the season must long in vain.

When I send my daughters to the Allentown Female College to be educated—as I hope to do some day or other—I do not care to have them transformed into walking encyclopedias, though, of course, I expect them to acquire much useful information. But, above all things, teach them to think—not about the follies and fripperies of fashionable life—but to think logically, and to form a sound judgment on any subject that may be presented to their consideration. Let their training be catholic, but not diffuse. Suffer one branch of study to be a stepping-stone to the next, thus preserving the organic unity of the whole course. At the same time, however, let every pupil have ample room to develop the special talents which God has given her. A college curriculum may be so strict as to become a machine for breeding dullness. If there should, by any chance, be one of the pupils whose tastes and talents differ widely from those of the rest, let her not, like Andersen's "Ugly Duck," be pecked at by the whole flock. Remember, that she may finally turn out to be a swan, who will soar into higher regions than her companions can possibly reach. If, for instance, she is fond of the higher mathematics, give her time to indulge her inclinations, though you must abridge the music lesson, for which she shows no aptitude. We consider Caroline Herschel and Maria Mitchell, measuring the stars and adding new members to our solar system, at least as worthy of admiration as some of the musical prodigies we sometimes meet at parties, who always claim to be out of voice and practice, and yet by dint of our earnest supplications, suffer themselves to be led to the piano, where they trill out for our delectation the latest Italian novelty. If one of the girls should be detected drawing clever caricatures of her companions, let her punishment be an extra drawing-lesson ; though she may not develop into a great artist, like Rosa Bonheur or Harriet Hosmer, the possession of a delightful accomplishment will, at any rate, scatter rays of sunshine over her whole life, and aid her materially in the accomplishment of her glorious mission of making others happy.

3. The beautiful, in this way, becomes an important element in the culture of woman. It is necessary that she should be possessed of those gifts and graces that will enable her to exert her influence to the best advantage. A rough diamond is incalculably more valuable than a beautiful pebble, but there are few who can recognize its excellence. Not until it is polished by the skilled labor of the lapidary, is it deemed worthy of a place in a monarch's diadem.

But if, as we are told, the work of polishing a precious stone requires the utmost care, as the slightest accident may destroy the beauty of the gem, how much more skill and patience are necessary when we undertake to polish a human mind and soul.

There is a meretricious polish, which is but too easily acquired, and which is very apt to dazzle weak eyes. We do not refer to the insane devotion to fashion, which is characteristic of the present generation, and which manifests itself in "the kangaroo dip," or whatever else happens to be the fashionable contortion. That is no polish at all—it is nothing but a very thin French varnish, which Miss Bridget O'Flaherty, whose brother has made his fortune in America, has no difficulty in acquiring within six weeks after emigrating from her native bog.

But even the most delightful personal accomplishments may become false and deceptive, when they are made an end in themselves, and are valued by the possessor only as a means of keeping up appearances. The brilliancy of a counterfeit jewel only increases our contempt, when we discover that the material is paste. While we have no desire to undervalue personal accomplishments, we insist upon it that they are valuable only in so far as they spring from thorough Christian culture. They must be the foliage of a sound and healthy tree, or they will not fail to prove sickly and offensive. We all instinctively feel that genuine courtesy does not consist wholly of graceful manners and a strict adherence to the laws of etiquette, but grows out of Christian self-denial, and consideration for the happiness of others.

In the same way, literary culture, to be agreeable in man or woman, must be genuine and unaffected. There must be no straining after effect—no use of high words and pompous phrases, in the hope of displaying great learning. The effect is apt to be directly the reverse. We are likely to agree with Jean Paul in his opinion that "people who use obscure language are like hosts who, whenever their wine is of inferior quality, present it to their guests in colored glasses, in the hope of thereby hiding the defect."

Indeed, persons who converse in this way are in very great danger of making themselves ridiculous. A young lady who presided at a tea-table at which the Hon. Thomas Corwin, of Ohio, was a guest, supposing that she must employ big words in honor of the occasion, asked him the question, "Mr. Corwin, will you take *condiments* in your tea?" meaning, of course, cream and sugar. With a twinkle in his eye, but with all the solemnity in the world, the witty statesman responded, "A little pepper, but no mustard, if you please, ma'am!"

Let me assure you that the days have passed by when the standard dictionary of the English language defined so simple a word as "net-work" as "anything reticulated or decussated, with interstices between the intersections;" and when a thimble was described as "a metallic, truncated cone, semi-perforated by equi-distant indentations." Chaste, simple language is always agreeable, while pedantry is everywhere avoided by people of the highest culture. A mother in London took her sick child to an obscure young physician. He said: "I observe that your heiress has premonitory symptoms of incipient rubeola." She took her to the most famous physician in the city who said, "The child is going to have the measles." Mr. Taine tells us in his Notes on England, of a great French artist, who having spent several days in the company of a number of English authoresses of the first-class, such as Mrs. Gaskell, Miss Evans, Mrs. Browning, Miss Muloch, and others, was astonished to be informed that they were possessed of literary distinction. "He found them domestic ladies of very simple habits. Not once did a hint of authorship or the need of speaking of one's self or books, occur during twenty-four hours of talk." Being invited to the country, he discovered that the lady of the house knew more Greek than himself, apologized, and retired from the field; then, out of pleasantry, she wrote out his English sentence in Greek. "Alas!" continues our author, mournfully, "in France we believe too readily that if a woman ceases to be a doll, she ceases to be a woman."

It is because you desire your daughters to acquire a kind of culture somewhat resembling that which we have attempted to indicate, that you have established an institution of which you have every reason to be proud. We have had enough of institutions that poison or warp the mind—whether by skepticism or by superstition—and we, therefore, insist on a good, solid Christian education, that will preserve our daughters in the faith of their fathers and mothers, and make them better able to meet and solve the problems of life and death. Not that we would neglect those accomplishments which will better enable them to become a blessing to the circle in which they move; but we would have the ornamental to be the crown and glory of the substantial, and not the reverse.

It is not for us, of course, to attempt to indicate minutely the means whereby this is to be accomplished. That is the special task of the professors of this institution, in whose skill and patience I am happy to believe you place implicit confidence. We trust, that in their hands, guided by the grace of God, our "jewels"—as the Roman matron called her children—will be polished and burnished, as by skillful lapidaries, until they glow like mirrors that reflect the glories of God's firmament above. Precious beyond comparison are such living stones in the sight of the Lord, and they shall be His, He tells us, "in the day when He makes up His jewels." May God grant this, their parents' fondest prayer, through Jesus Christ our Lord!

After all we have said, is it possible that there should still be some "old fogy" here present who will persist in asking the question, "*Cui Bono?* Granted that genuine Christian culture is an end and blessing in itself, what practical results—what worldly advantages—do you expect to achieve with reference to the social condition of woman?"

To questions of this kind, let us say, that we have not come prepared to give an answer. They are not directly connected with our theme, and have become mere questions of political expediency, which our politicians will no doubt settle for us whenever they can thereby subserve the interests of their particular political party. Personally, we do not quite agree with Grace Greenwood, who says she is in favor of giving the right of suffrage, as a reward, only to such women as can in case of necessity "keep a boarding-house and support an invalid husband decently." While we appreciate the excellence of the service, we do not quite appreciate the excellence of the reward. Though it would be rather late in the day to assert the incapacity of woman to perform acceptably any public service, when there is not a single branch of literature or science in which she has not won the brightest laurels, she has, we think, a right to be excused from the performance of tasks which, at least, appear to conflict with that modest shrinking from publicity which is the chief charm of her nature:

"'Tis not to lead the battle on;
'Tis not to till the soil;
'Tis not to sit upon a throne,
Or share the victor's spoil;
'Tis not to speak to multitudes,
Or on the sea to roam;
No! None of these are woman's rights,
'Tis her's to rule at home."

We would give woman every right that she really desires. Let there be no discrimination between man and woman in matters of property and inheritance; let not narrow conventionalities prevent her from seeking in any honorable way to earn an honest livelihood. If she is gifted as an authoress, an artist, a painter, a sculptor, a musician—an orator, even—so be it! Let her have fair play!

But things of this kind do not constitute woman's mission, nor are they the objects of woman's culture. The highest aim of a true woman will be to be useful, wherever it may please Providence to order her lot. She cannot be satisfied to be a mere cumberer of the ground—to remain the only bee in a great industrious hive that gathers no honey. We are not speaking of physical labor, though even that is honorable. The mother of king Lemuel was, of course, a queen, and yet she does not hesitate to say of the model wife: "She looketh well to her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness."

There is, however, something besides food and raiment to be cared for in this probationary world of ours. The men of the present age seem to be almost entirely given up to the service of Mammon; let it be woman's mission to seek to check this spirit of utilitarianism—to bring man back to the true, the beautiful, and the good. Let her not be ashamed to labor in the cause of her Divine Master—the woman's Son—to whom she owes deliverance from the worst of slavery.

I sincerely trust, Young Ladies, that you will never imagine your sphere to be too narrow, or your influence too contracted. If you really aim to be useful there will be no lack of opportunities. Even to sit, like Mary, at the Saviour's feet, is to perform an acceptable service. Let your sympathies be active, not only towards those who are near and dear to you, but to all who suffer and need relief. Remember Phœbe, and Tryphena, and Tryphosa, who were proud to be called "the servants of the church," and Dorcas, whose lovely name has become the synonym of every lovely deed. On whom shall the church depend in her great philanthropic enterprises but on her daughters, who are always more ready to weep with those that weep and to rejoice with those that rejoice, than her sons, whose hearts are apt to grow hard and selfish in the rough battle of life?

Wherever such an angel of mercy goes, her gentle presence will soften and subdue the spirit of the wicked as the music of David's harp quieted the passion of king Saul. Favors that would be indignantly rejected, if offered harshly or contemptuously, will awaken the warmest gratitude when presented by a cultured Christian woman. "Did she preach you a sermon?" inquired a soldier, during the late war, of a comrade who had just received a kindness from one of the volunteer nurses. "No use in preaching a sermon," responded the sufferer, "the woman is a powerful sermon herself."

We have not time to consider the influence of such a woman in her family and in her daily social life. Yet, who can fail to appreciate the blessings of a refined Christian home? Who can doubt that if such a woman is blessed with children, her Christian culture will tell powerfully on their education, life, and character? In short, wherever women of true culture may reside, they are the bright polished corner-stones of society, teaching the world by their innocent cheerfulness, that Christianity is not synonymous with melancholy; but that "the children of the king" have every reason to rejoice in their Father's favor, and in the certainty of a glorious inheritance. Surely, when we find among the results of woman's culture, that it makes faith stronger, home happier and heaven surer, we need not seek further to find others.

I am glad that an institution devoted to such objects has been founded in this city. I rejoice that the Reformed Church, of which I have the honor to be a minister, has been instrumental in its establishment. It will prove a blessing to your children and your children's children, and I bespeak for it your cordial sympathy and support.

And now, Young Ladies of the Allentown Female College, having brought you my imperfect offering, and having once more bid you and your worthy professors, God speed! in your noble work, I feel that my part in the exercises of your commencement is—ended.

> **"My simple chaplet, now no longer *mine*,**
> **I leave to bloom or wither at your shrine."**

ART. VI—THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL MOVEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO THE CAUSE OF EDUCATIONAL RELIGION.

BY REV. J. SPANGLER KIEFFER, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

THE recent improvement in Sunday-schools deserves the respectful and grateful recognition of all Christian people. It is not long since the Sunday-school was an obscure and neglected institution. Thought, time, and means were but scantily expended upon it. Any accommodations, however insufficient; any refuse religious books, however unsuitable; any teaching, however incompetent, were deemed good enough for the Sunday-school. There was little private interest, and no public enthusiasm in its favor. What character and usefulness it possessed in those days, was given it by a few humble, laborious, self-denying persons, whose memory is to this day a sacred treasure in many a heart throughout the land. But it lacked the necessary facilities to do its work efficiently; it pined under neglect; and so, as an institution, it had a feeble and sickly existence, as a plant of generous nature is languishing and stunted for want of nurturing care.

A few years have wrought a remarkable change. The Sunday-school has grown into a prominent and important institution. Both privately and publicly it has gained for itself recognition, interest, and enthusiasm. Time, talents, and money have been unsparingly expended for its advancement. Its literature, its teaching and its government have engaged the attention, and enlisted the labor of many of the best men in the country. The work has been organizing itself and seeking for the advantages of system and uniformity. County and State Conventions are held, in which the leading questions relating to the Sunday-school are discussed with great earnestness, and general conclusions, so far as possible, arrived at. A most laudable zeal is manifested in seeking to gather in all poor and neglected children; in establishing Sunday-schools in destitute places, and in furnishing libraries to those too poor to purchase them. The increased activity is particularly noticeable in the field of Sunday-school literature, where we find the most astonishing multiplication of religious books for the children, the number of library, music, and text books being already large and constantly increasing. One of the best indications of all, is the amount of earnest, humble, unobtrusive labor in the Sunday-school, performed regularly and not without self-denial, by Christian people.

It is not strange that, commingled with so much that is excellent and admirable, there should be much also that is unworthy and trivial. The mode of conducting Sunday-schools, the nature of Sunday-school teaching, and the character of Sunday-school publications, have recently been much criticised by good and thoughtful men, sometimes, perhaps, with undue severity, but yet, it must be acknowledged, with considerable justice. It may, we think, be reasonably questioned whether the attempt to render religion easy, popular and pleasant, has not been carried in the Sunday-school further than is wise; whether it is not dangerous to cultivate an exaggerated taste for the "funny" in matters of religion; and whether the jolly and frolicsome manner in which it is often thought necessary to carry on the work is productive of the best results. The effort to render religion cheerful and sunny for the young people is undoubtedly legitimate; but when it is sought to make religious instruction prevailingly an amusement, there is room seriously to consider "whether, when we teach religion in the way of sport, our pupils may not thereby be gradually induced to make sport of their religion." It will scarcely be denied that, in the multitude of Sunday-school books, there is a vast amount, not only of useless rubbish, but of literature that is positively injurious, and calculated to beget and foster a false and pernicious taste for trivial reading, and a distaste for the Word of God and religious books of the better order. Whole schools have been poisoned and demoralized in this way; on this account superintendents and officers find the selection of libraries a most difficult task; and many feel that in the former times of more scanty libraries, and more thorough study and committing to memory of the Scriptures, there was still something which may be thought of with regret. Nor can it be considered a favorable sign that the hymns which are sung in the Sunday-school are forever changing; that there seems to be little taste for those hymns which ages of use have proved the best adapted to express the devotional feelings of Christians; that the liveliest tune is generally the most popular; and thus the most popular hymn too often, alas, the one that is most trivial and has in it the least of the spirit of worship. Moreover, it could scarcely be otherwise, in present circumstances, than that much of the Sunday-school teaching should be incompetent; some of it not only incompetent, but misleading. It is to be mentioned, also, that, in the general spirit of the movement, there is much that is censurable and unworthy of the cause. This is especially perceptible in the conventions, in which are found those faults which usually accompany religious enthusiasm. The proceedings of these conventions often remind one, both amusingly and painfully, of the fabled Mutual Admiration Society. In the numerous speeches there is often an unpleasant magnifying of self, and a painful want of humility and reverence. Amid much that is earnest, humble, and worthy of all praise, this is found to be a favorable field, also, for the demonstrations of that spirit which is self-confident, arrogant and loud; which hesitates not to speak in its own praise; which sees no possibility of danger or mistake; and scruples not to call sharply to account the Church and the Ministry, if they seem not at once to have the same views, and adopt the same means with reference to the furthering of the great cause.

Another peril to which the Sunday-school movement is exposed ought to be mentioned here; the more so, because it is a peril of which few, if any, of its leaders, show signs of being aware. We cannot, however, do more than hint at it here, for to bring it fairly to light would require a long discussion. We believe, with one who has written thoughtfully and earnestly upon the subject,* that the imparting of religious instruction must, in order to be successful, be characterized by a certain necessary *reserve.* This is shown by the example of our Saviour, who, though He went about extremely desirous to disclose Himself, was yet forever hiding Himself; who revealed Himself only in proportion to the susceptibility of men to receive Him; and who could not make Himself known unreservedly and indiscriminately for fear of the most disastrous consequences. It cannot be otherwise with the communication of religious truth. Such communication can take place safely and successfully only where a certain sacred reserve is at the same time cautiously and reverently maintained. The truth, while seeking to disclose itself, and just in order that it may disclose itself, finds it necessary often to withhold and hide itself; and injury must ensue wherever there is a violation of this infallible principle. If this be so, one cannot look without concern and fear, upon the absolutely unreserved and indiscriminate style in which the Sunday-school movement seems to deem it necessary to proceed in the imparting of religious instruction. It seems to be acknowledged as a principle that nothing is to be withheld. The most sacred things are handled without anything of concealment or restraint; and it seems to be regarded not only as permissible, but as an imperative duty, to put forward at all times, boldly and without reference to circumstances, the most awful and unfathomable doctrines of the Christian religion. One cannot look upon these things, we say, and not fear what the ultimate result may be, of a method so contrary to that of our blessed Saviour. Without being able to explain ourselves at length upon this point, we are convinced that a great peril exists here, and it is mournful to think that it is one of which the movement itself seems to be wholly unconscious.†

---

* See, in the "Oxford Tracts," the one entitled, "On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge."

† It would not be just to represent this dangerous method as peculiar to the Sunday-school movement; for this only partakes of it in common with much of the prevailing Christianity of the times. What has been said of the movement in question, may be said with equal truth of much of the preaching of the day, and of the means in general by which it is sought to diffuse a knowledge of the gospel.

Such are some of the imperfections, faults and dangers of the movement; notwithstanding which, as we have already said, it embraces so much of moral earnestness and a true desire to do good, as to be worthy of the respect and gratitude of all.

At present, however, we are concerned with the movement, only as it is related to the cause of Educational Religion. For it is plain that the deeper significance of the increased attention and interest which the Sunday-school has of late been calling forth, lies in this, that the irrepressible truth of what is known as educational religion is thus coercing for itself the recognition of its claims. The religious world is awaking to the fact that a vast and most promising field of Christian activity has, to a great extent, been lying neglected. It is coming to be realized that the age of childhood and youth is a vantage ground for the Christian religion, the importance of which has not been fully appreciated; that it is a strong fortress which there has been too much disposition to leave for a time in the undisputed possession of the enemy. Under the influence and inspiration of this newly-awakened feeling, Christian people of almost all denominations, have, it seems, been girding themselves for more earnest labor in this hitherto imperfectly cultivated field. Thus the Sunday-school, which, in a certain sense, presides over the religious life of children and youth, has come to be invested with a new character and quickened with a new life. It is not what it was in its earlier years; it is regarded in a different light, animated by a different spirit, and managed in a different way. That there is such a marked contrast between the past and the present, in the history of the Sunday-schools, no one, we think, will deny; and few, we suppose, would refuse to acknowledge, that at the root of this change lies the change which has come over the views of Christian people, with regard to the relation of children and youth to the all-important interest of religion. The movement itself, indeed, does not hesitate to avow such a change as we have described. There are not wanting acknowledgments, on the part of representative Sunday-school men, to the effect that, in the past, a mistake was made in the manner in which childhood was regarded, or disregarded, in a religious sense; and that now it needs to be viewed in a different light and treated in a different manner. It has been too much the custom (it is confessed) to look to maturer years as the proper sphere for the operation of God's grace, while the religion of children has been regarded with suspicion, or, at most, as an exceptional phenomenon. Now, however, not only is the age of childhood regarded as a legitimate sphere for the operations of God's Spirit and grace, but it is just that sphere in which the largest results may be expected as the recompense of Christian activity. The religion of children is now looked upon without suspicion, as something normal, having a nature of its own, and calling to be provided for with special appliances and care.

In proof of the fact that such a change of mind is acknowledged to have taken place, we would refer to the published proceedings of the Eighth Annual Convention of the Maryland Sunday-school Association. We make use of the proceedings of this Convention, both because they happen to be the nearest at hand, and because the Convention in question, having been, by common consent, one of the most successful of all that have hitherto been held, may be considered fairly representative in character.

At one of the sessions of that Convention, the Rev. L. W. Bacon, of Baltimore, delivered an eloquent address, which was received, it seems, with universal approbation and applause. From this address we make the following quotation:

" It is painful to think what mistakes have been made even by the greatest and best of men on this cardinal question. Turning back the records of the Church of Christ, we are as those who, reading in the strata of the rocks the history of God's work in the creation, come now and then upon the relics of some horrid and repulsive monster. There occurs to me just now one of the fairest pages of the history of the Church, that on which the illustrious Jonathan Edwards wrote the story of that unquestionably divine work, which was wrought through the preaching of himself, and of the Tennents and Wesley and Whitefield, the event known in American history as 'The Great

Awakening." Amid the memorials which he gives of God's grace working upon one heart and another, he mentions, as a thing quite out of the course, not only of nature, but of grace, the story of a little girl of four years old, who passed in successive stages through all the phases and symptoms of a religious experience as those symptoms were laid down by the doctors of that day; from carelessness to seriousness, from seriousness to gloom, from gloom to despair, and then (after a sufficient interval) from despair to joy and peace in believing; and the good man tells the story with the evident conviction that that was the regular and only correct way for a little child to enter the kingdom of heaven, but that it was not much to be expected that many of them would come by that course.

"Alongside of this story, let me put another of a different sort, but illustrating the same point. One of the most eminent and beloved of the pastors of New York City was telling me in a little confidential circle of brethren, the beautiful story of his Christian experience: how with the earliest dawn of recollection he became conscious of a deep, tender love for God his Father and Christ his Saviour; how this feeling grew with his childish growth and strengthened with his strength; how in later years there were variations and fluctuations of feeling, and crises of religious experience, which had made him suspect that at such or such a time he was converted, and first began to be a Christian; but how, as his knowedge and experience had grown, he had settled clearly in the conviction that if ever he had known the grace of God, he had known it from the time of those earliest recollections. A few days after this, I met the venerable father of my friend on Broadway, and told him that his son had been telling me the story of his religious life. 'Oh no, he hasn't,' said the good old man; 'he can't remember that story. Only his mother and myself can tell it. It goes back to his cradle!' Who will undertake to say at what point such a life may not be begun by the inworking of the Holy Spirit?

"But mark what sort of reception this sort of Christian meets with in the church! We are not prepared to expect divine grace in the mouth of babes and sucklings; and so when we see the signs of grace there is nothing to be done but to put the subject of them into the category of grown-up Christians at once. We forget that regeneration does not change a child into a grown-up person but only changes it into a *Christian child*, but just as much a child for all that. 'And so,' said my friend, 'they did all they could to ruin me.' They made an 'infant phenomenon' of him. In that great metropolitan Presbyterian Church they stood him up on a bench to make public prayers in the prayer-meetings as soon as he could talk plain. In short, they gave full illustration of the fact that the Church of our day does not know the art of caring for Christian little children."

To hear such words is encouraging, especially to those who have maintained, while others virtually denied, the possibility of a religious development, beginning with earliest childhood; and who have believed such to be, not the exceptional but the regular and normal course of the Christian life. Those who, in dark and evil times, have continued to cherish the idea and maintain the practice of educational religion, will welcome as the sign of returning day such a recognition of what has so long been disregarded and denied.

There is room, however, to inquire whether this is a true and full, or only an apparent and partial, recognition of the claims of educational religion. "Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again," indeed; but how often it rises only in the form of a new perversion, or to stand in wrong relations. This is the fearful advantage of error, in its conflict with truth, that it has power to turn the victories of truth into its own victories, and that it is often only after having been repressed, and baffled and perverted a thousand times, that the truth comes to a full and proper emergence. Let us inquire whether this may be the case in the present instance. To do so, it will be necessary first to make some observations on the general subject itself.

Is there any room for religion to be educational? This is a question which carries in itself the strong presumption of an affirmative answer. For the natural supposition would be that Christianity, being meant for man, would own and have power to appropriate whatever belongs essentially to human life. The famous saying of the heathen writer "*Homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto*," is true, in an especial sense of Christ and His religion. It is also a question upon which there is much of a practical nature depending. For it is easy to see how much is gained for Christianity, if there is anything in it corresponding to what education is in the sphere of our natural life; what increase of power it obtains if it can make its own one of the profoundest, most general and most powerful forces which have to do with our human life; how much more extensive is its dominion, if, in an educational form, it is capable of commencing with the very commencement of human existence.

If there is any possibility for religion to exist in this form, there is one thing which, unquestionably, it must presuppose and in which it must have its ground. Such religion must rest upon the basis of the actual presence beforehand, in some real sense, of what it proposes to bring to pass in the way of Christian character and life. It is true of all education that what it seeks to realize, is, from the beginning, at hand, and that whatever results it may end in will be found to be only such as were in principle already present when the process began. "As a stone cannot be cultivated into a plant, and as no training again can cause a plant to become an animal; so in the spiritual world, it is not possible, by mere nurture of any sort, to carry the evolution of life beyond the principles and germs which are already imbedded in its own constitution."* Educational religion presupposes thus the germinal and virtual presence beforehand of the Christian life which it aims to develop. In other words, in order to produce Christians, by any process of cultivation, it is necessary, first of all, that there should be Christians in some sense to begin with.

If this is a paradox, it is at least a thoroughly scriptural one. For what has been said coincides entirely with what God's word teaches and implies with respect to the subject. It has been well remarked that the state of those to whom the

---

* Dr. Nevin's "Historical Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism."

Apostles write, "is marked by the singular characteristic that they need to *become* what they *are*." In one sense, they *are* "saints;" in another, they need to *become* "holy." They *are* the "children of God," but they must also *become* His children. They *are* "dead unto sin," but they need to "mortify the old man." They *are* "risen with Christ," but they are exhorted to arise and "walk in newness of life." And all this in such a way that the possibility and necessity of their becoming what is set before them as their destiny and duty, grounds itself in what they are solemnly declared already to be. The seeming contradiction of this disappears when we distinguish between the presence of life in principle and germ and the presence of the same life in a state of development and activity; and consider that the latter always has its ground in the former. The acorn is, in an important sense, an oak; but it needs also to *become* what it is, that is, to be unfolded into a full-grown tree. An infant is, without any figure of speech, a man; for it carries all the powers of manhood wrapped up in itself; but it must also become a man, in the sense of having its slumbering faculties and powers awakened, developed, and brought into actual exercise. And, in either case, the possibility of any such process of becoming depends upon the fact that all which it is thus sought to actualize is present from the start in a real though embryonic, form. Not otherwise is it with the Christian life. Here, also, one *is* a Christian, that he may *become* a Christian; a Christian, first, in idea, principle and germ, that he may become one in actual repentance, faith, love and obedience. And the power, if such there be, of producing Christian character and conduct by the means of education and training, depends upon the existence of this anterior and underlying state.

If this be correct, if educational religion is not possible, except as having Christians, in some sense, to begin with, a most important inquiry is, whence comes this antecedent and fundamental Christian character or condition? In undertaking the work of educational religion, how shall we be assured that that basis is at hand without which all our work will be mistaken and in vain?

Very plainly, this prior presence of grace is not to be found in our nature as such. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Because our nature is a fallen and sinful one, it contains the seeds of death, not of everlasting life ; and there is in it no possibility of being changed and transformed by any training or education whatsoever. To attribute to it any such possibility is an error, which, we suppose, would be cordially and emphatically disavowed by those with whose opinions we are dealing.

It may be said, however, that the first advent of grace into our nature, and the earliest establishment of that gracious relation, without which we have seen educational religion to be an impossibility, comes with the repentance and faith of the individual. To this it is to be replied, that educational religion, in the proper sense of the term, contemplates the possibility of beginning as soon as there is possibility of education in any sense, and, thus, before the acts of repentance and faith are possible ; and, further, that, instead of presupposing repentance and faith as necessary to its own existence, it belongs to the idea of religion, in this form, to call forth and develop these activities together with all else that pertains to the Christian life. Evidently that cannot be the antecedent basis of the process, which is a part of the process itself.

Not in nature, and not in an act or experience which is capable of taking place only at a more or less advanced stage of human life ; but in a divine transaction which is intended to coincide with the commencement of our being, do we find the foundation for which we are seeking. Those who believe in and practice educational religion, in its true sense, find the ground of its possibility in Baptism, and have never claimed for it validity or power, apart from the reality of Baptismal Grace. And, certainly, if there is any room to deal with religion in the way of which we speak ; if there exists the possibility of making Christians, in any true sense, by cultivation or training, this is the point where that possibility lies. Either there is no necessity for such a foregoing gracious relation, which we have disproved ; or, it is found elsewhere, which we have shown is not the case; or it must lie in what the Church has always regarded as the initiatory and fundamental act of religion, in the first transition from the realm of "the flesh" to the realm of "the Spirit," namely, in the sacrament of Baptism. If this be so, then not only must baptism confer grace, but such grace as to carry with it the presence, in principle, of the new man, and the possibility and beginning of that glorious process which embraces the forgiveness of sins, repentance, faith, love, obedience, sanctification by the Holy Ghost, and which has its completion in the "resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." How beautifully the ground of this process and the process itself, are set forth in the Collect for Trinity Sunday: "O God, the Creator and Saviour of the world, who hast made Thyself known in the work of man's redemption, as the mystery of the ever adorable Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Three in One and One in Three; reveal in us, we beseech Thee, the full power of this faith, into which we have been planted by baptism, that, being born of water and of the Spirit, we may by a life of holiness be formed into Thine image here, and rise to Thy blissful presence hereafter, there to join with the song of the seraphim, in praising Thee, world without end."

It is needless to say that when those who believe in the reality of educational religion look upon baptism in this light, as a being ingrafted into Christ, as a being transplanted into the world of grace, and as bestowing, in germ, the presence of a true and complete Christian life; this is only because such is believed to be the testimony of God's word. Our Saviour's solemn words, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" His command to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" the reiterated allusions to baptism in connection with the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost; all these compel the belief that the necessary initial transition from the realm of the flesh to the realm of the Spirit lies in this sacramental transaction. Moreover, what is thus more than once distinctly expressed in the Scriptures, is, in the most remarkable manner, everywhere implied. It is plain that the Apostles presuppose those to whom they write to be in a state of grace. They are all "in the Spirit;" they have all "put on Christ;" which is made to be the ground and motive of their walking in the Spirit and leading lives of holy obedience. Now, what constituted them all one in the enjoyment of this fundamental gracious and responsible relation? Not their repentance, for it is made to be the ground of their repentance; not their holiness, for it is urged as the reason of their leading holy lives, which it is known many of them were far from doing; but only in this, for only in this were they all, without discrimination, *one*, that they had been "baptized into Jesus Christ."

If this be what the word of God teaches and implies, it is plain that baptismal grace lies at the root of educational religion; that it is, so to speak, the principle of its being; that it is that without which there is no room to conceive of religion in this form. It is this which furnishes what we have seen the idea of educational religion absolutely demands, namely, the presence beforehand of the principles and germs of a Christian life, to be called forth by religious training.

This brings to our view the educational process itself, the process by which one who *is* a Christian, in consequence of his covenant relation, is to *become* one in the way of developed Christian character and actual Christian experience. Educational religion takes it for granted that the baptized child is a Christian, acts upon this assumption, and seeks to afford it such Christian nurture as may awaken and call forth into activity the possibilities of divine grace that lie slumbering within it. The seed, in order to grow, needs the light, and the warmth, and the moisture; not otherwise does the child of grace require for its growth the light, and warmth and moisture and all the holy influences of the world of grace in the bosom of which it stands. It needs to be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." It needs a warm bosom of religious life, the sunshine of a Christian home, and the influence of Christian example. It needs to be taught to pray, to be instructed in the doctrines and duties of religion, to be guarded with sacred care against every incipient sin. It needs, not to be taught that it is its duty, at some future time, to "come to Christ," as if it had never come to Him at all (which would be a fatal mistaking of its position); but, as a child of God, it needs to be constantly reminded that it is its *present* duty to be loving and faithful and obedient to God. It must be given to feel, not that it is one who may be expected sooner or later to become a Christian, but that, as a Christian, it may be expected already to be living, in its own way, as a Christian ought to live. All instructions and admonitions must be based upon the fact that it has already "come to Christ" and received the grace of God. And it is easy to see how these admonitions, when made from such a basis, have a peculiar power which otherwise they would not possess. Take a seed, bury it in the dry dust, and expect it to grow, and you expect an impossibility. Take a homeless, fatherless and friendless child, and exhort it to filial affection and obedience, and you do but mock. But place the seed in good soil, and you may then expect it to grow. Take a child, with father and mother, and in the warm bosom of the family, and urge it to be affectionate and obedient, and your words mean something then. So, approach a child, as one standing outside of the covenant of grace, and never having come to Jesus, and exhort it to be loving and obedient, and your words are shorn of their force; they sound like mockery. But deal with it as with one who is "in the Lord," one who is in the bosom of "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost;" urge it, because of this, to flee from sin, to love and obey God; and the exhortation will come home to the heart with a peculiar power and have a grasp upon it which otherwise it could not gain.

Experience, we think, proves that, where this course is pursued; where earnest account is made of baptismal grace and baptismal obligations; where there is a genuine Christian nurture in the family and in the Church, by instruction, by admonition, and by example, there the most precious results are sure to follow. Under the influence of such Christian training, the grace which came almost with birth itself, begins to unfold itself gradually and beautifully into a Christian life. When the child awakens to a sense of its relation to its God and Saviour, and begins to realize its privileges and responsibilities as a baptized person, it is found that, ordinarily, it comes to a knowledge of sin and penitence for it, and manifests a willingness and a desire to yield itself, in faith and obedience, to the Lord. Baptism is succeeded by confirmation with its solemn vows, and the use of the Holy Communion and the other means of grace continues, deepens and strengthens the reign of grace in the heart. Where the necessary conditions are most faithfully observed, this process will generally be gradual, continuous and almost imperceptible; silent, according to the analogy of all growth, in proportion to its depth and power. In many cases, however, it will be accompanied by inward crises, more or less violent, of religious experience; and sometimes, especially when Christian training has been imperfect or wanting, the result will be reached at last, where it is reached at all, by the abrupt breaking-through of long-resisted grace and the sudden conversion from a life of sin. But, with only such exceptions as prove the rule, the process of educational religion is one which starts with baptismal grace, and, by Christian nurture, in the bosom of the Church, gradually develops therefrom a piety which grows with the growth and strengthens with the strength.

The history of those branches of the Christian Church which have maintained the old faith in sacramental grace and the ancient practice of catechetical instruction, proves that a sound, healthy and vigorous piety is best developed in this way. We venture the assertion that the greater part of the best, most symmetrical, most vital religion of the present day, has had its growth in this quiet and undemonstrative manner. And it is somewhat remarkable that, even in those denominations whose custom it has been to despise catechetical instruction and everything that savored of educational religion, many of the most conspicuous, honored and trusted Christian men are those whose piety has come to them in this way.

When, now, after having been engaged in the study of this subject, we return to the movement whose merits we are considering, and inquire whether it be, what it seems to be, a recognition of the truth of educational religion, we must reluctantly confess that this does not appear to be the case. If what has been said is correct, it is plain that the possibility of forming Christians by religious training has its root in the reality of baptismal grace; and that, if this be denied, there is no room for the conception or the practice of educational religion, in any true sense of the word.

Now, it is certainly remarkable that a movement which bears the appearance of advocating educational religion; which seems to make vast account of the religious interests of childhood, and the possibility of a religious life beginning to develop itself already in the years of infancy; should, first of all, set aside the sole fact upon which the possibility of such a religious development must depend. We are not aware of any instance in which this movement has made open, or even implied acknowledgment of that in which its work of educational religion (if such it is intended to be) would be compelled to ground itself. We do not remember to have heard, in any S. S. Convention, or to have seen in the proceedings of any such Convention, or to have read in any document accepted as representing the Sunday-school cause, any distinct or indistinct declaration of the reality of baptismal grace. On the contrary, so far as we are able to comprehend the general spirit of the system, we judge that such a declaration would be rejected with marked disapprobation and displeasure. It is evident from this, that, however the religion which the Sunday-school cause owns and advocates may be educational in appearance, it is not so in reality. Notwithstanding seeming resemblances, it is not that of which we have been speaking as educational religion.

Nor, when we inquire more closely, does it appear that the movement professes to believe in or to practice anything of this sort. It is consistent at least in not pretending to do what its very stand-point leaves no room for. What it aims at, is, after all, something very different from what the friends of educational religion might at first have expected and hoped.

What, then, *does* it seek to accomplish?

If we consult the statements of those to whom we must look for information, they do not seem, strictly taken, to be quite at one among themselves. For example, in the proceedings before us, we seem to discern two separate and distinct objects set forth, each as the end to be accomplished. In a leading address there occurs the following passage: "The problem we study, is, how to take this childhood, with its imagination, and love, and faith, and restlessness, and so train and restrain and teach it, that *it may result in* a Christian manhood or womanhood." This appears to be an intentional and deliberate statement of the object, which one might therefore expect to be sufficiently guarded; and it would seem to declare that it lies in the power of religious training, and is the purpose of such training, so to mould and direct the natural child, that a Christian may be the result. This, of course, is nothing else than the old heresy of Pelagianism; and it would be bad enough, certainly, if the Sunday-school movement were to plunge itself bodily into this gulf. We are convinced, however, that this utterance must not be taken (though it seems to be such) for a guarded and authoritative statement of the problem. Rather, it was a vague and careless declaration; it would not be accepted as official; and, indeed, it is virtually contradicted in a subsequent portion of the same speech. It is unnecessary, therefore, to dwell upon this erroneous representation of educational religion here, seeing it is not rightly owned by those whose views we are discussing. But it is worth while to refer to it in connection with this subject, because of the general vagueness which makes such statements possible, and because one must fear that much of the prevalent opinion respecting the object of religious training is unconsciously of this heretical order.

Setting aside this and similar statements as careless and not official, we find substantial agreement among the representatives of this cause, in declaring the object to be *the conversion* *of the child.** The aim of all religious training of children, it is said, is to "bring them to Jesus." This, we may say, is universally accepted as the true aim of Sunday-school work, and these words, indeed, have become a sort of common watchword among Sunday-school workers. Now, this phrase is a good one, and, taken by itself, would be readily accepted, even by those whose conception of educational religion we have been describing, as a true and correct statement of the necessary object of all religious instruction. For these, in all their religious training of the young, would acknowledge themselves to have no other object in view than to bring them to Jesus Christ their Saviour. To "bring them to Christ," to "make them Christians," is a terminology which they can consistently and cordially adopt. But, when we consider the sense in which these words are taken, there comes to view at once a broad difference between the two sides. For it is plain that the movement in question proposes to bring the children to

---

* At this convention an address was delivered by Rev. Dr. Fuller, of Baltimore, in which there occurs the following passage: "The one aim of the Sunday-school teacher must be the real conversion of the child. Some are satisfied with teaching the Catechism; but nothing is really done for eternity, until the being who is 'by nature a child of wrath' becomes by grace a child of God."

This is certainly a distinct declaration of the object of Sunday-school teaching, but it is at the same time a glaring misrepresentation of the friends of educational religion and catechetical instruction. How can they be said to be "satisfied with teaching the Catechism," who hold it as a principle that neither catechetical instruction, nor Sunday-school teaching, nor any religious training whatsoever, can have power as a means of making Christians, apart from the fact of the previous grace of God given in Baptism? Certainly, this is very different from being "satisfied with teaching the Catechism."

The above extract seems to be a great magnifying of the grace of God over against those who are supposed to rely upon other means. How much truth there is in this will appear when we oppose to the misrepresentation of this random and reckless antithesis a statement which is just, we think, to all the parties concerned. Educational religion relies, *first of all*, upon the grace of God sacramentally given beforehand; and *then* upon Christian nurture (embracing catechetical instruction and all other educational instrumentalities) as the necessary means by which this grace is to unfold itself and be turned to practical account. The Sunday-school movement relies *first* upon religious instruction, and *then* upon the Holy Spirit, "seconding these efforts," to bring about the conversion of the child. Let any impartial person decide which of these two systems, in its work of teaching the young, gives the prior and higher place to the grace of God.

Jesus, *as those who have never, in any sense, been brought to Jesus before;* to make them Christians, *as those who are not, in any real way, Christians at the time.* What is aimed at, is the conversion of the child, as the independent starting-point, altogether in the future, of the Christian life. Not only is it not taken for granted that the children who are to be made Christians, *are* Christians already, but this seems to be especially guarded against, as an absurdity and a dangerous error, while it is supposed, and hoped and prayed for, that the instructions which are given, being "seconded" (according to the speech last quoted from) by the Spirit of God, may lead to their eventually becoming "new creatures in Christ Jesus."

Now, if what we have said be true; if educational religion is the nurturing process by means of which one who is a Christian in principle and germ becomes a Christian in the actual possession and practice of repentance, faith, love and obedience; then it is easy to see that we do not find educational religion here. The Sunday-school movement cannot deny the one fact which alone gives vitality and power to religious instruction, as a means of making Christians, and yet find it possible to practice educational religion. Where the reality of baptismal grace is denied, and the real though embryonic Christian character of baptized children disowned, there is no room to make religion educational in any true sense of the word. Consequently, when the Sunday-school movement, in dealing with the religious interests of the young, seems to be so thoroughly educational, this is necessarily more in appearance than reality. What it believes in, seems to be an educational *preparation* for religion; educational *religion* it is not. To the great question, Is there any room for religion itself, as related to children, to be educational? it answers practically, No. It is one thing to be tending a field in which seed has been sown, and to be looking with confident hope for the appearance of the blades of grain; it is another thing to be working in a field, not with the expectation of any present growth, but with the indefinite hope that at some future time the seed may be deposited there. It is one thing to be imparting religious instruction as a portion of the nutriment by which the new nature of the baptized child is to grow and become strong; it is another thing to impart such instruction, that it may so influence the mind as to lead ultimately to the child's conversion. It is one thing to say to a child, "You are a Christian; you must hate and flee from sin, and be living, in your own way, as a Christian person ought to live;" it is another thing to say to him, "We are teaching, and laboring, and praying that you may some day become a Christian." It is one thing to say, "You are a child of God; you ought to be loving, and faithful, and obedient to your Heavenly Father;" it is another thing to make the same exhortations without being able to assure him at all that he is God's child. Such, without any misrepresentation, is, we think, the difference between the method of educational religion and that of the Sunday-school movement.

We would guard against being understood to say more than we intend. We are simply declaring that the Sunday-school movement, as apprehended by us, does not realize the idea of educational religion. Beyond this we are not pronouncing judgment upon it. We hope to be preserved from that fatal narrowness of spirit which would confine the Holy Spirit to a single method of operation, and deny the activity of God's grace where there is no formal recognition of its natural and necessary order. We thankfully acknowledge the vast amount of Christian truth which the system embraces and diligently teaches, as we have already conceded, also, the great moral earnestness and the sincere desire to do good, by which it is characterized. All this, however, may be truthfully granted, while yet it may appear that the basis upon which the movement grounds itself, and the method by which it proceeds in its training of the young, are not such as most truly correspond to the idea of the Christian religion, and such as the best results may be expected from. The present and immediate good which it accomplishes may be freely acknowledged, while there may still be room to fear what the indirect and ultimate results may be of a system so one-sided and so poorly corresponding to the true idea of Christianity. This, we think, is the state of the case with the Sunday-school movement. If, as we think we have shown, religion is not only capable of being educational, but was meant to be so, and must needs assume this form in order fully to answer its own idea; and if a sound, symmetrical and reliable piety is best developed in such manner as we have described; then the Sunday-school movement cannot, in the nature of the case, fail to place itself on this ground without danger of confusion and error and spiritual detriment. That it does fail so to do, we have seen. This is its principal weakness, and, among all its perils, there is none equal to this.

In not recognizing the possibility and necessity of educational religion, the Sunday-school movement remains, after all, substantially one with the system which it criticises, and with which it would appear to have broken. It censures, as we have seen, the ignorance and incompetence with which, in former times, a certain portion of the Church was accustomed to deal with the religious wants of childhood; and its own theory and practice bear the appearance, at first, of being something different and far better. A candid examination, however, shows that, as to educational religion in the true sense, the system we are considering, agrees with that which it condemns, in the rejection of it. So far as we are able to see, the Sunday-school movement differs from the system over which it claims so much superiority, simply in this, that it recognizes the necessity of devoting more attention to the religious interests of childhood, and believes that, under the influence of religious training, *the conversion of the child may be expected sooner* than it was in former times looked for. In principle, there is no difference between the two. As to the Christian life, how it begins, and the means by which its development is promoted, they stand in perfect agreement. Of baptized children as being Christians, and of religious training as the process by which the new nature of the Christian child is to be developed, they both alike, know nothing.

When, therefore, we enumerate, as we now propose to do, several of the leading defects by which the Sunday-school movement is hindered and crippled in its religious training of the young, we are at the same time pointing out some of the defects of that more general type of religion, in the bosom of which, notwithstanding a slight and incidental difference, it nevertheless stands.

1. This movement fails to make proper account of the age of childhood, as this exists in the bosom of the Christian Church. It does not know, and seize, and take advantage of, the extraordinary opportunities of this important age, for religious purposes. It will be deemed audacity to make this charge; for is not the movement accustomed to claim this very thing as its peculiar and distinguishing merit? Nevertheless, the accusation is just and true. The characteristic advantage of childhood, for religious purposes, lies not merely in its relative innocence and greater susceptibility, but in this, that, as it exists in the bosom of the Church, it carries in itself the possibility and beginning of a Christian life, the development of which, may, without any delay, be carried forward. Not to see this, and make practical account of it, is certainly to fall short of realizing the extent of childhood's advantages, in a religious point of view. What is needed, and to be expected, in the case of a Christian child, is, that, under proper nurture, such a child should be growing in grace and bringing forth the fruits of repentance, and faith and obedience; but, in the hands of this system, instead of being made to feel the immediate and present obligation he is under, of leading a holy life, he is simply being prepared, as well as may be, for such time as it may please God to give him His grace and make him a Christian. What a strange perversion is here; what a mistaking of the child's true position and actual relations; what a loss of time and opportunity; what a failure to make right account of the immense vantage-ground of Christian childhood! Out of its own mouth is the movement condemned, when it charges the Church with "not knowing the art of caring for Christian little children;" for it does not itself know this art, and it is ignorant of it, because it does not know that, to begin with, there are "Christian little children" to care for.

2. In basing itself as it does, the Sunday-school movement loses, to an alarming extent, that grasp upon childhood, which, in order to be truly successful, it ought to have. Any one who enters into the spirit of the New Testament Epistles, will perceive that their instructions, admonitions and exhortations derive their altogether peculiar power and force from the fact that those to whom they are addressed, are regarded and treated continually as being already, all of them, Christians. This is the tenor of all the apostolic exhortations: Ye are "in the Spirit," *live therefore in the Spirit;* ye are "dead unto sin," "*let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body;*" ye are children of God; *be ye therefore followers of Him as dear children;* "Ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord, *walk as children of light;*" Ye have received the grace of God, *see to it that your having received it be not in vain.* It is easy to see that the strength of the exhortation here lies in the fact of the grace already received. Now, these are the types of all Christian appeals and exhortations. What a powerful sweep and force the appeals of the Christian teacher possess, when there is upon the part of the taught, such a recognized and felt relation to the world of grace, as brings home to him the necessity of the holy obedience to which he is exhorted. But, where this is not the case, there these admonitions and appeals are shorn of almost all their strength; there the mighty leverage is wanting; there the strong grasp upon the heart and conscience of childhood is gone. And, that this is not the case with the Sunday-school movement, we have, alas, seen too plainly. Indeed, prior to the "conversion" which it aims at, there seems to be no room at all for the use of such apostolic exhortations; whereas, it needs their strong and powerful grasp for the very purpose of bringing that conversion about.

3. This movement, or the type of religion with which we have seen it to be identified, has indirectly done much to retard the cause of true religion, by making it a strange, foreign and repugnant thing to the young. Nothing is more thoroughly *human* than religion; and it is of the greatest importance for the progress of religion that this truly human character should

be preserved. But where it is denied that grace is capable of coming with earliest infancy, and of being, under proper nurture, the element in which, from the beginning, the child lives and moves, and has its being; where it is practically taught, that there is no possibility of being truly religious, until after the peculiar experiences of a conversion, indefinitely located as to time, but sharply defined as to character; there one inevitable consequence is that religion assumes, for the young, an unnatural, spectral and ghastly aspect. It becomes an unearthly thing of "protracted meetings" and "revivals," rather than of the daily life; and loses altogether that familiar and home-like character, which, according to its very nature, it ought to wear. One reason, unquestionably, why religion has so little hold upon the young, is the *un-human* guise in which it is made to confront them. And that it bears this character is one direct consequence of the method which this type of religion pursues with the young. The Sunday-school system, it is true, makes special efforts to make the young feel "at home with Jesus," but, alas, the difficulty lies in its very stand-point, and will not be removed till this is surmounted.

4. The movement is crippled by a want of thorough harmony with the Church. The Sunday-school can have no significance or power apart from the Church. This is, to some extent, felt by the movement itself. In opposition to a strong disposition to look upon the Sunday-school as "the child's Church," there are some who justly say, "This is a dangerous error, and one which we must frown down." Nevertheless, from its very nature, the system involves a tendency to regard itself as an independent work, and thus to stand, to its own great injury, in more or less disjunction from the church. Where the Church is felt to be the institution by which people, both old and young, are to be built up in the faith and hope of the Gospel, containing the sacraments and means of grace for that purpose; and where, on the other hand, the Sunday-school is carried on in the spirit of the S. S. movement, as represented by its Conventions; there will always be felt to exist a painful and embarrassing dualism, between the Sunday-school

and the Church. It is a trite saying, indeed, and one which has come to be accepted as true, without being at all looked into, that "the Sunday-school is the nursery of the Church." But we appeal to any pastor, whose church and Sunday-school stand in such relation as we have described, to know whether he has found this to be the case, in any such degree as the saying would seem to imply. This side of the movement, indeed, constitutes by itself an important and interesting theme, upon the discussion of which, however, we cannot enter now.

In what has been said, it will be perceived that we have chosen to take for granted, the baptized condition of the children of the Sunday-schools, notwithstanding the well known fact, that many of them are not baptized. This will give rise to an objection, to which it is necessary for us, before concluding, to reply. It will be objected, namely, that such a plan of educational religion as we have indirectly been advocating, is manifestly impracticable, seeing it supposes the baptism of those who are thus to be trained, while a large proportion of the Sunday-school children are unbaptized. To this we reply, that the argument is not affected by this fact. For, supposing this to be the real objection in the case, it would apply only to the unbaptized, and could not possibly extend to those who are baptized. We reply further, that the present unbaptized condition of many children, is a state of affairs which has itself grown out of the loss of faith in the reality of baptismal grace; and that, as such, it cannot be used as an argument, where the question is as to the truth and validity of a system of religion which grounds itself in that reality. The real objection to educational religion lies not here but elsewhere; and elsewhere we deem that it has been answered. The true difficulty is, not that the Sunday-Schools contain many unbaptized children, but the fact which is the cause of this, that there is no belief at all in the grace-conferring nature of baptism. Baptismal grace is that with which educational religion stands or falls; and, where this is denied, any attempt to realize the idea of such religion must be, in so far, but a "catching at the shadow of the truth."

ART. VII.—CONSCIENCE AND THE VATICAN.

An Address on the Origin of the Present Revolt in the Catholic Church, Delivered March 20th, 1872, in the Guerzenich Hall of Cologne by Prof. Reinkens.

TRANSLATED BY PROF. J. S. STAHR.

THE present reform movement in the Catholic Church touches the entire culture of humanity. For this reason it is possible to consider it from so many different points of observation. I shall endeavor to-day to prove that it originated in the conscience of individual Catholics. For our reform movement is nothing else than the effect of the voice of God raising itself *in man* against the voice of the tempter *from without*, who appears clothed as an angel of light; the war we wage is the war of conscience against compulsion in matters of religion.

The system of church polity adopted by the Roman Curia, which has now been developed to its extreme and most repulsive consequences, endeavored centuries ago to force itself upon the Christian nations under the shield of divine authority, and the result has been that now nearly one half of Christendom, *i. e.*, about one hundred and sixty-eight millions of Christians, are no longer in church communion with the Pope at Rome. But why have so many millions remained in external communion with him?—about one hundred and seventy millions, for the common estimate of two hundred millions is much too high; no one can obtain that number from reliable statistics.—Previous to July 18th, 1870, it was still possible for the individual to save his conscience, the Catholic could still respect himself. This, however, is not generally admitted. The advocates of infallibility maintain that even previous to that time, the individual believer had no right of conscience as opposed to the conscience of the entire episcopate; and as they now make the Pope to be the Church, they also refer to him the general conscience of the episcopate, and find this just as natural as convenient. Some Protestants also tell us, that before July 18th, 1870, the conscience of Catholics had been already actually bound and silenced, inasmuch as the Pope had exercised the functions of universal bishop and infallible teacher since the Council of Trent without meeting with any persistent opposition.

I will first answer the latter objection. It is true, as in recent times the index-decretals and papal briefs against Hermes and Guenther found most willing and inexorable executors in the Archbishop of Geissel and the Prince-bishop Foerster, so also were the earlier papal constitutions against Bajus, Jansen, Quesnel and the Synod of Pistoja executed by the bishops without examination. Yes, as in the year 1864 the bishops in general made themselves pliant tools for the execution of the Church polity of the Roman Curia in the syllabus, by which not only the modern state, but also a peaceful condition of society on the basis of brotherly love, was condemned, and even destroyed so far as papal power reaches, so also the episcopate succeeded as early as in the last century in forcing upon the faithful the immoral bull Unigenitus, (published by Clement XI in 1713) as a moral norm, with the single exception of the Church of Utrecht, to which the Jesuits gave a bad name for this reason. This bull insinuates the doctrine (Nos. 91, 92) that the Catholic, if the hierarchy should endeavor by threatening a manifestly and flagrantly unjust excommunication to keep him from the discharge of his duty, and move him to betray and give up the truth, must yield to the threat, neglect the performance of duty and betray the truth. In this way undoubtedly faith and morality are torn from the conscience root and branch, and all truly pious and righteous life is destroyed in the Church. And thus it would seem, judging even from these few examples, that the objection to the effect that the conscience of Catholics had been bound and silenced previous to the 18th of July, 1870, was fully justified; but this is not the case.

All that the Pope had accomplished up to July 18th, 1870, amounted only to this: that by his power, with the assistance of the temporal rulers, he maintained his position as a judicacatory from which there was no appeal, inasmuch as he at once set aside the appeals to a general council which were made from time to time. If any one who had been either attacked or condemned by the Roman Church appealed to an ecumenical council, the pope came with his punishments, the temporal princes helped to inflict them, and the injured individual was silenced.

Meanwhile no one recognized the Pope as a judicatory of last resort for three centuries and a half; such a judicatory was, therefore, not introduced by the apostles, and hence is not a divine institution. We know very accurately from history that the Council of Sardica (after 343) first established such a judicatory in the person of the Pope for pronouncing judgment in the hierarchy, but not as if it taught that such power was found in the regular succession of the Apostle Peter. The council rather made this arrangement because of its own absolute authority as representing the entire Church. The right was conferred for the sake of expediency, not recognized as previously at hand. After the patriarchate which was then the western, or the Roman Catholic Church, had become separated from the four eastern patriarchates and from the country which was the cradle of Christianity, *i. e.*, after the middle of the eleventh century, the Bishop of Rome in consequence of historical development, as the only patriarch of the Occident, constituted the supreme tribunal of the Western Church. Now the most was made of this, because there was no longer an Oriental Church to oppose it. The supreme judicial tribunal was used for the most general purposes of centralization. From this time forward, inasmuch as the popes, on the basis of forged documents which were produced on the grandest scale in the ninth and eleventh centuries, endeavored just as greedily as unscrupulously to obtain absolute control over that part of Christendom subject to them, they gradually drew by unwearied and long-continued efforts, all ecclesiastical matters, discipline, ritual, and finally also doctrine into the domain of their judicial decisions, whilst at the same time they claimed supremacy over kings and emperors, with absolute authority, thus confounding temporal and spiritual matters to a point where all distinction ceases.

But when at last, in the early part of the fifteenth century the Roman popes had led the Western Church to the verge of a precipice; when the Roman Church was torn by internal dissensions into three parts, headed by three popes with their respective Curiæ and colleges of cardinals, so that all occidental Christians without exception found themselves excommunicated by the anathemas of three popes crossing each other triangularly; then God raised up men who knew the history of the Church, and who possessed sufficient integrity of character to bring to light the image of the old Catholic Church from the writings of the Fathers, and to show it to those Christians who still had a sense for the freedom of the children of God, and for true piety. And it was through their exertions that the great councils of Constance and Basel were called. According to the old Catholic spirit these again placed the highest power in law and doctrine into the hands of the ecumenical councils, inasmuch as these actually represent the law and doctrine of the whole Church. The superiority of the council over the Pope was acknowledged by the latter himself as well as by the whole Western Church. But when the Roman Curia had again received a head, and had recovered from its fright, it appeared that it had learned nothing. Not only were all efforts at reform rendered abortive by the Roman court, but the corruption was even heightened, and the consequence was that the Western Church suffered a permanent division, the consequence was the Reformation of the sixteenth century, which occasioned still greater centralization on the part of the Roman Curia. Now the Pope succeeded for the first time, with the assistance of his self-constituted pretorian guard, the "Society of Jesus," and through the constant service of the blinded Catholic, as well as Protestant princes, to deprive the Western Catholics, who were still dependent on him, of their ecclesiastical rights, and to domineer over them completely. Now for the first time after the Council of Trent the oath of allegiance which the Pope required from the bishops did its full work. Not a word did it say of their duties toward the faithful, only of numerous and heavy duties toward their "lord," as they henceforth were obliged to call the Bishop of Rome, who confirmed, that is *appointed* them. In behalf of the universal government, for henceforth the Pope acted practically as universal bishop without hindrance, the Roman Curia, as we know it at the present time, was now gradually organized, this gigantic machine, with its numerous boards and congregations, of which Christian antiquity knew nothing. Now a company of upstarts collected there, who commenced to consider all the nations outside of Italy as barbarians, and with unbounded pride pretended to be in communication with the Holy Spirit, in virtue of which they demanded blind obedience from all the faithful. Government, discipline, ritual, doctrine, everything was now brought in final decisions into judicial formulæ, and the unity and life of the Church were based on command and obedience, which in the end will destroy both.

But notwithstanding all this, the individual Catholic still had room for saving his conscience; for however submissively all were obliged to bow before the decisions of Rome if they wanted to enjoy the blessings of the Church and the rights of citizenship, no one was, after all, called upon to believe that the Roman decretals *were in themselves true and just*, no matter how strongly the court theologians maintained that they were so. Even a curialistic theologian like Hergenroether must admit in regard to the so-called doctrinal decisions of the Roman Pope published during the last centuries, that the bishops had accepted them "not because they had found them correct, but on account of the authority of the chair of St. Peter," or as we would say: *on account of the actual power of the popes.* But the well-informed believer could not be disturbed in his conscience even by this authority. For above it stood the impregnable authority of the Councils of Constance and Basel. The former had, during its fourth and fifth sessions adopted resolutions of the most far-reaching consequence and significance, and which had never been lawfully revoked previous to July 18, 1870, and of course could not be revoked. In the fourth session it had taught and resolved, "that the general council properly assembled in the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it represents the Catholic Church, has its power *immediately* from Christ" (not mediately, therefore, through the Pope, as the Jesuits teach) "and that every condition and every rank, even the Pope, is bound to obey it in all things pertaining to the faith, to the removal of schism, and to the reformation of the Church in head and members." In the fifth session it was resolved that the Pope was obliged thus to render obedience to every ecumenical council. The same council also refused to admit that the co-operation of the Pope was necessary to the validity of the Council; it deposed three popes, and elected a new one only after a long interval; and the claim of obedience proves precisely this, that the opposition of the Pope alone does not destroy the universality of the Council.

These resolutions were confirmed and repeated by the Council of Basel. They were made an imperial law for the whole German nation by the Diet of Mayence during the March of 1439. In the so called "Fuersten Concordaten," i. e., in five bulls of Pope Eugene IV, of February 5 and 7, 1447, this Pope accepts the above-mentioned decretals without reserve, and promises to keep them faithfully, particularly in the bull which commences: *Ad ea ex debito.* The German nation had made this the condition upon which it would recognize him as Pope, and really so recognized him. And this happened under Emperor Frederick III, who was unusually devoted to the Pope, and made other concessions to the Roman Curia for which he has been very much censured. Even this emperor did not yield the superiority of the council over the Pope, inasmuch as the council was the highest ecclesiastical authority, receiving its power immediately from Christ in the representation of the entire Church, and Eugene IV submitted, although he had eight years before held the Florentine Council, from which already the advocates of infallibility wish to draw the doctrine of papal infallibility. On the 28th of March, 1447, the following Pope, Nicholas V, gave over to the wrath of Almighty God and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, every one who would dare to resist the agreement which his predecessor had made with the German nation, an arrangement which he recommended to be kept inviolate. On the strength of this the German nation recognized him as the new pope at the Diet of Aschaffenburg, July 13, 1447, and in consequence the so-called Aschaffenburg Concordat was concluded at Vienna, February 17, 1448, the principal basis of which were the reform decretals of the Diet of Basel which particularly emphasize the superiority of the council over the Pope. In addition to this the same concordat guaranteed to the German nation the right of demanding a general council, and on such a demand the Pope was bound to issue a call. It is true that Rome often violated the concordat without venturing, however, to assert that it had no binding obligation upon the Curia, even if this was secretly believed; but the Germans, after their complaints had proved ineffective, inserted the concordat into the electoral compact, and since the time of Charles V, every new emperor was obliged to accept it as part of his oath. Later popes, however, as Clement VII and Julius III again recognized the legal relations founded on it. At the Council of Trent, it is true, the Jesuit General Lainez, in a speech which ridiculed the divine institution of the episcopate and the superiority of the council over the Pope partly founded on it, had represented the bishops as simple delegates of the lord of the Church in Rome, and had defended a proposition concerning the primacy of the Roman high priest, which was already very similar to the Vatican decretal of July 18, 1870. But this excited such indignation on the part of the still self-conscious episcopate, and such dignified and powerful words were spoken under the leadership of the Archbishop of Paris, that the Curia withdrew the proposition. Thus the Aschaffenburg concordat, based on the resolutions of the Councils of Constance and Basel, retained its full force for the Catholics of

Germany. Every one could, when he received violence from Rome, justify himself in his conscience by appealing to it, and to a future general council, or at least comfort himself with the thought of justification by such a council. That is, every one was at liberty, while he submitted to a papal decree, to deny the truth and justice of it before God, and before men, if in so doing he followed his own conviction and his conscience, no matter whether the Roman Curia disputed this right and meditated new punishment or not. However much the Pope might usurp, decide, command, condemn, curse or teach, and however much he might carry out, with the assistance of the Jesuits and the temporal princes previous to the 18th of July, 1870, the individual believer could still *save his conscience.* The Pope was not the final, determinative authority for his judgment and conscience; if he was obliged to submit externally and to retire before superior power, he was *not* compelled to *believe* that the contents of the papal decrees were *true* and *just.* The Pope might condemn an appeal to a general council as often as he pleased; the right of such an appeal had for centuries been guaranteed to the Catholic even by the popes themselves, and his conscience could feel satisfied. The actual power of the Pope was for him no proof of truth and justice. Even during the growth of papal power in the middle ages, this was still the opinion of the most respected, the best men in the Church. When the popes commenced to subjugate the bishops, and for a beginning hit upon the cunning expedient of declaring single bishoprics free from the metropolitan bond, and abbacies separate from their bishoprics and immediately subject to their own power, St. Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century recognized in this proceeding an interference with the apostolic episcopal order, and addressed himself to Pope Eugene III as follows: "By such a practice you show indeed that you have the fullness of power, but not that you possess the fullness of justice in the same measure; you do this *because you can do it*, but whether you *should*, that is the question." And Bernard gives the answer: You should not. This was the interpretation allowed to every Catholic of the

Roman Catholic Church previous to the 18th of July, 1870. The power exercised by the Pope is not the measure of his justice ; and still more, the so-called doctrinal decisions of the Pope *ex cathedra,* accompanied by anathemas, are never in the world the standard of eternal truth, which our conscience alone determines. Whoever submitted to a Roman decretal stood precisely in the same condition as a citizen of the state when he submits to the decision of the superior court ; in the very act of submission he may conclude in his own mind that the decision is a flagrant act of injustice ; if he has good reasons for it his conscience will allow it.

The Vatican, inspired by the Jesuits, has now completely changed the state of affairs. Since the 18th of July, 1870, no Roman Catholic is allowed to submit to papal decretals without thinking and saying at the same time that they are in themselves incapable of improvement, because they are in themselves true and just. As early as the 13th of September, 1868, the Pope maintained in his encyclical letter to all Protestants : "Ecclesiastical authority," by which he means himself, " must govern the convictions of the human reason (or *regulate* them as the Jesuits say), and guide the actions of men in private and public life ;" and he thought it was the duty of the Protestants, on the occasion of the council in the Vatican, to submit their reason and their conscience. And he wished to secure the same submission of all Catholics for all future time by the declaration of infallibility, for which the destruction of the apostolical constitution of the Church by the erection of the tyrannical throne of a universal bishop, only opened the way. The proposition : I am infallible in matters of faith and morals, signifies in its application nothing else than : I define your thinking and control your will ; or, I am the regulative norm for your reason and the law for your actions.

I wish now in the first place to call attention to the fact that we have to do here with an insipid and violent transfer of the constitution and fundamental idea of the Society of Jesus, to the whole Roman Catholic Church. Jesuitical papers, shortly before the Vatican Council, made the strange demand of all Catholics with continually increasing boldness, that it was necessary to sacrifice to authority not only the will, but also the understanding (the famous *sacrificio dell' Intelletto*). Well-informed and pious Catholics were astonished. Such sentiments were regarded as the startling utterances of a madman. But this was only the demand found in the thirty-fifth section of the Statutes of the Society of Jesus (*Summarium constitutionum*, § 35). According to it the superior has not only to command that the subordinate should act thus or otherwise, but also that he should *think* or *judge* thus or otherwise; and it is accordingly the duty of the subordinate to obey, inasmuch as he (thus it is literally stated) "renounces every individual opinion and his own rational judgment, with a certain *blind obedience*." And then follows in section thirty-six the revolting comparison, that the believer is in reference to his superior like a corpse which can be turned in all directions or treated in any manner you please, or like a cane in the hands of an old man. The comparison is very lame, however, for the statutes to which we have referred after all demand a judgment and a conviction; they demand namely that the believer be convinced that through his superiors he is really guided by Divine Providence, and he is to judge, therefore, that their doctrines are in themselves true, and that the actions which they command are in themselves just, that is in accordance with the moral precepts of the Gospel. Let me give a few examples. The one, strange as it may sound, is a great favorite in the cloister. If the superior says to the subordinate: "Take this flower and plant it with the flower cup in the earth and the root above," the subordinate ought not only to execute the command without a murmur, but he must also think that thus it is rational. If the superior says: "Thus God intended it when He created the flower; it is a perversion, a departure from the laws of nature, that the plant carries its flower cup above," the subordinate must believe that this is true. Furthermore, if the superior commands something that is not permitted, that is according to the best knowledge of the subordinate, forbidden by the laws of God and man, he must, nevertheless, judge and feel convinced that it is just. A Jesuit who teaches otherwise acts against both the letter and the spirit of the statute of his society.

This statute, therefore, has now, since July 18, 1870, been transferred to the whole Roman Catholic Church. In the modern church of infallibility every believer is said to stand in the same relation to the Pope as the Jesuit to his superior; that is he must not only externally submit to the decrees of the Roman chair and its boards as a supreme juridical tribunal; but he must also judge and be convinced *against* his individual *knowledge* and *conscience* that *these decrees are just and true*, that they are the *word and law of God.*

Against such an assumption the conscience of the individual Catholic revolts, and from this revolt of the moral and religious spirit in us, our present reform movement has come forth.

We were taught in our youth, we learned it by heart in the catechism: "The voice of conscience is the voice of God." What can claim greater authority over us than the voice of God? Bishop Krementz of Ermeland has lately said to the Curé Grunert at Insterburg: "The church is higher than the conscience." As he said this in order to make submission to the Vatican decree of infallibility plausible, he could only mean by the term "church" the *pope*, as is generally customary among the bishops at the present time. That would mean, therefore; The Pope is higher than conscience, his voice is higher than the voice of God. Our conscience has already driven our opponents to make assertions of this kind which afford a deep insight into their intellectual as well as moral condition. They despair of bringing their doctrines, which are absurd and directly opposed to the apostolic tradition, in harmony with our conscience (which they like to call private judgment,) and hence they profess to despise this voice of God in us, on the authority of a man who in boundless self-exaltation claims divine prerogatives, and whom they reverence as their lord and master with fear and trembling. But we solemly declare in opposition to all this: There is nothing higher than conscience! And if an angel should come from heaven, and try to force something upon us as true against the voice of our conscience, we would repel him and say: There is nothing higher than conscience. If any external authority is to prevail for us as divine, it must not suppress and smother the voice of God in us, but gain its assent; for whatever comes from God is not yes and no, but yes; not strife, but harmony. It is well known that the Son of God is called "The Word" in the Sacred Scriptures, or according to the Greek "the Logos." Now the fathers referred both the voice of God in us and external revelation back to the Logos and therefore they taught with common consent that there could be no contradiction between the gospel and conscience.

When therefore we hear the voice of conscience within us, we have a right to inquire who it is that ventures to contradict this voice. It is inseparable from man, and in the development of his rational nature it must become audible; it speaks without being called upon to do so, yea, against the will of him in whose breast it dwells; it commands, but submits to no dictation; it weighs and judges his words and deeds. And thus also it weighs and judges every word and law that comes from without, and tests it whether it be of God, tests it by the ideas of truth and justice. In this respect also no one can defy this voice unless he is prepared to become a hypocrite before God and man.

If now the Pope represents himself to us as the possessor of absolute divine authority over our thoughts and actions, and therefore demands of us that we should recognize his decisions *ex cathedra* as in themselves true and just, our conscience cannot remain silent. And it speaks loudly; and because it speaks we are assembled here to-day! The voice of our conscience can have for itself only that which is received in us and by us rationally and freely, not forced upon us by external compulsion. The mediation of the word and the law coming without, for our consciousness, in which knowledge and conscience meet each other, can be accomplished only through the activity of reason and freedom under the control of enlightening and strengthening grace. And this is the reason why Jesuitical papers, even before the council, endeavored to prepare us for the irrational decretals, by urging upon us that in order to be a good Catholic it was necessary to sacrifice not only the will, but also the reason. For this reason also, since Pius IX wishes to set up his infallible authority in opposition to our conscience, he demands the sacrifice of the individual reason and freedom. For if this sacrifice is made, the individual conscience no longer acts; instead of it we then hear nothing but the confusing cries of fanaticism.

I have said that our church movement has sprung from the opposition of our conscience to the Vatican decrees. Permit me now to throw a little more light upon this subject, or in other words, make it practically plain, and I entreat you all to call your own consciences to witness.

Let us first take an example whereby we can test the certainty of the voice of our conscience.

We read in the Scriptures that God had determined judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and that Abraham interceded and received the promise that if there were even two righteous men in these cities they should be spared for the sake of these two. Christ has taught that the days of tribulation, which must needs come upon mankind, should be shortened for the elect's sake. I ask: Does not your conscience agree with this? The internal voice answers with joyful assent to the external word, Yes, this is the character of God. He is, in His very essence, goodness and mercy. But now take the opposite: the Pope teaches all through the middle ages, that he has the right, on account of one guilty person, or rather one whom he considers guilty—but who perhaps is not guilty—to jeopardize the salvation of millions of innocent Christians throughout an entire country by means of the interdict, by depriving them of all public worship, of the sacraments, of an honorable burial, in order to incite them to insurrection or violence against this one, or to punish him.—Does your conscience also say yes to this? (cries: No, No!)

I will also let your conscience pass judgment on what was done in the Vatican Council.

For a thousand years or more no Christian thought of believing that the Pope of Rome had received immediately from Christ authority to exercise common jurisdiction in any diocese of the whole world, that he is the universal shepherd who appoints and removes bishops, who possesses the fulness of power in himself, and only calls the bishops to take part in the same. Yes, Pope Gregory the Great, declared as late as the close of the 6th century, that the erection of a universal episcopate, even at Rome, would expose the whole church to the danger of destruction. But the papal constitution of July 18, 1870, proclaims the Pope of Rome universal shepherd, and quotes, as if for the purpose of proof, words of Gregory M., which in the mouth of that Pope mean precisely the contrary. Gregory M. says it is his honor that all the bishops should retain inviolate the honor which they have received immediately from Christ. Pius IX, in his constitution would make us believe that he said: If I am honored then are also the bishops honored, for their honor is contained in mine. The well informed, reflecting Catholic recognizes in this a falsification in favor of the destruction of the old apostolic church order. The injunction now is: "Do not reflect, do not read anything that will make you reflect; the Pope thinks FOR YOU and in him GOD HIMSELF thinks. But the voice of conscience in the true believer contradicts this, for it is not true. Or does your conscience assent to it? I say no! (Applause.)

Since violence is now done to the conscience, the honest Catholic must attach himself to the reform movement. And where do the bishops stand? They resist the voice of God, they resist the manifest truth, when they say: the Church, *i. e.* in their sense, the Pope, stands higher than conscience, Such an assertion is outrageous.

During the same period of time no one thought of believing that the Pope could, even provisionally, give doctrinal decisions for the whole church. We were taught in our youth to consider it a Protestant slander that Catholics were obliged to believe that the Pope was infallible. The Irish bishops, in order to obtain political equality, made an official oath that such doctrine did not belong to the faith of the Catholic Church. On the 13th of July, 1870, eighty-eight bishops, the representatives of Catholics among the enlightened nations, one of whom represented more believers than fifty bishops of the former States of the Church, solemnly testified before the assembled council, that according to their belief the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not contained in the word of God. The newly elected Popes of Christian antiquity affirmed that they honored the decrees of general councils like the Gospel, in order to receive the recognition and church communion of the other bishops, so also did they not pretend to make doctrinal decisions as if by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but endeavored to justify their faith by Scripture and tradition, considering the activity of the Holy Ghost as general in the Church, where it could be discerned in the emperor, in the individual theologian as well as in the synod. We know that Popes have erred in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity concerning the trinity, the person of the Redeemer, grace, &c., that three ecumenical synods condemned Pope Honorius as a "heretic," and that for centuries the Popes swore to the justice of this condemnation. And after all this we are to be thrown out of the Church by the Papal decretal of July 18, 1870, if we are not convinced that God has revealed and Christendom always believed that the infallibility of the Church is in the exclusive possession of the Pope of Rome, and that therefore his decisions in matters of faith and morals "are perfect in themselves, and not because the Church agrees with them." Our conscience, because it is a Catholic conscience, cannot give its assent to this perversion of the Divine word. (Applause.)

In order to enable us to recognize in the Catholic Church the divine word from tradition, we had a peculiar, definite norm —a *principle* of tradition. Protestants objected to our position by saying that even if tradition contained any Christian doctrines beyond what is contained in the Bible we would not be able to recognize and prove such doctrine with any degree of certainty. We were taught to answer this objection by saying: We possess a sure criterion for this. If, for example, it cannot be proved that any given doctrine is of post-apostolic origin, and nothing in opposition to it is found in the faith of the Church, but on the other hand, going back as far as we please, the universal faith of Christendom in all ages and countries testifies in favor of such doctrine, then we can explain its presence in such general form, only by referring it to apostolic origin, or to apostolic preaching. In this sense, therefore, the winged word of Vincent of Lerins: *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, has not only obtained the most general recognition in the Catholic Church for almost fifteen hundred years as the most convenient expression of the norm of tradition, but the council of Trent has given it a more explicit form by saying that the doctrine of tradition "had come to us from hand to hand in uninterrupted succession through all generations." But when in 1870 the bishops of the opposition in the Vatican Council, who spake for a majority of the Christians represented there, having still respect for their conscience and their honor, applied this criterion of tradition to the doctrine of infallibility, whose origin demonstrably belongs to the latter part of the middle ages,—when bishop Hefele, with his book concerning Honorius, had driven the leading Cardinals into a corner, and the latter did not conceal their embarrassment from the Pope, and when one of the bishops remarked to the Pope that he could not disregard tradition, then Pius IX., spoke the surprising words: "I am tradition!" (Laughter.)

This word, destructive at once of the norm of tradition and thereby also of the principle of the Catholic Church itself, the genuineness of which no one has as yet questioned, became the basis of the action of the majority in the Vatican Council at its final session, and of the minority after their flight in their submission at home. Pope and bishops have promulgated in official documents the principle which does violence to the whole course of history: "Because the Pope declares anything a doctrine in faith or morals, therefore it is the contents of tradition." Hitherto the Catholic principle has always been:

"Because something is contained in tradition, and is so recognized, therefore it may be pronounced the word of God by general councils, and established as a dogma." Pope and bishops have thus with despotic violence completely reversed the principle of tradition, and thereby destroyed it.

Can our conscience assent to this? Is it pride now, that we have started a movement of Church reform in opposition to that revolution from above, that we oppose and resist until death that violent, forced construction of the norm of Catholic tradition? Is it pride or conscience? No, pride, self-exaltation, the carnal spirit, external power, material possession, money and riches,—all these things are on the side of our opponents; but on our side is CONSCIENCE and THE TRUTH. (Long continued applause.)

The Council of Trent commands Catholics to interpret the Sacred Scriptures only according to the interpretation of the fathers, *i. e.*, in the continual sense of tradition. But every sensible man will readily admit that, in order to do this properly, we must not overleap the first six centuries, which are evidently the most important for the traditional understanding of the Scriptures. This is, in fact, the proper "period of the fathers" in the church terminology. Well, Luke xxii. 32, we find a passage in which Christ addresses Peter: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter had just expressed, on the day before the Lord's suffering, his bold self-confidence; the Saviour now kindly foretold him his fall, but promised him also his conversion, for which He had prayed; and, as an offering of thanks in return, He requested that Peter should afterward strengthen his brethren in the faith. There was no thought here of doctrinal decisions, of an office, or of a successor. When Peter continued in his self-confidence, the Lord plainly foretold him his threefold denial. This is the context of the passage. The fathers of that period often had occasion to interpret this passage, and not a single one of them ever thought of finding in it a reference to the preservation of the faith in its purity, or to a ministerial function, as successor to the Apostle Peter at Rome, or to a successor of Peter at all, in the most general sense. And rightly so. The apostles were not only apostles, called and sent for the founding of the church, in the name of Jesus, but, like all other men, they also had need of personal salvation, and for this reason the Saviour sympathized with them; and the passage under consideration treats of the personal salvation of Peter, who denied his Lord with an oath before a maid-servant. But the Roman Curia, in the Vatican decree of July 18, 1870, has employed this passage as the only one to prove (in opposition to the unanimous interpretation of the fathers), that Pius IX. has the divine right to declare himself infallible; that Scripture passage, we are told, contains the promise that Pius IX., for example, can infallibly decide whether the body of man has natural life in itself, or whether it consists of dead matter (as in Guenther's case), or that he expresses the Word of God when he condemns the fundamental laws of Austria as horrible, and declares them null and void! In this way the rule of Scripture interpretation, which the Tridentine Council has made normative for the church, is set aside, and another main pillar of Catholicism is overthrown. Our conscience resists this mode of procedure, and, therefore, we are among the opposition!

I have just read the latest work of Bishop Ketteler of Mayence ("Die Centrumsfraction auf dem ersten deutschen Reichstage.") In the preface he complains that, in the German diet, one is in a certain sense *spiritually bound* "not only by the necessarily strict order of business, but still more so for the sake of the other members who have the same right of speech"—a kind of passive condition, which prevents one from saying many things one would like to say on a given question, or to justify a particular vote. But if this be so, to what extent must the Baron of Ketteler have felt himself "spiritually bound" in the Vatican council, where every exertion should have been made to bring forward *the whole testimony* of Christendom concerning the faith, and of which he now asserts, with all those who have "submitted," that it was free! Let us briefly recall a few incidents.

When the council was called, the subjects that were to engage its attention were intentionally kept secret; and yet these were subjects on which, according to the Catholic principle, the testimony of the whole church should have been collected. Hence, the bishops appeared in Rome unable to give the full testimony of their dioceses, because they had not inquired concerning it. The episcopate was entirely passive in constituting the council, and hence it became not an organism, but a mechanism. An order of business was forced upon it which necessarily impaired its freedom. The pope tyranically retained the free right of making motions for himself alone; so also the final right of definition. Thus, we find, according to the official documents, that on the 18th of July, 1870, not the council but the pope spoke. The proceedings could not be generally understood, on account of the audience-chamber and the language; the stenographic reports were kept from the bishops — a difficulty which Baron von Ketteler did not even encounter in the German diet. In Rome, the bishops were under police supervision; tours of recreation they were not allowed to make. Bishop Hefele was not permitted to have his book on *Honorius* printed in Rome; he had to turn to Naples; and yet Herr von Ketteler could have a private declaration printed in Berlin; he could even distribute it among the deputies in the diet. Bishops, whose independent testimony was received with particular ill-favor, because of their dependence upon the Roman Curia in other respects, were disciplined and bitterly reproached by the pope, who took no personal part in the labors of the council, but acted behind the curtains, representing to them even that they held the office of bishop by his favor. The journalists, often of doubtful reputation, who, in falsified reports, shamelessly abused the bishops of the opposition, before the mass of people who were incapable of forming a judgment, were praised by the pope in official briefs. A second order of business destroyed the last vestige of freedom. The bishops of the opposition came praying with petitions to the pope as to a father, but were despised, as unprofitable servants. Finally, things came to such a pass, that these felt something of manliness within them, and, on the 8th of May, 1870, they made a memorable protest to the proceedings. In this protest, they consider it incompatible with their dignity as bishops, their official position in the council, the rights which pertain to them as members of the council, to present petitions which, as their past experience has more than sufficiently taught them, are not only not granted, but not even answered. They consider the mode of procedure adopted by the presidents of the council as in the highest degree dangerous to the church and the apostolic see, they wish to guard against having part in the responsibility for the unhappy consequences before men and the frightful judgments of God, which must necessarily follow, and they desire that their written protest shall be an imperishable document of all this. But they were disregarded also with this protest. Then came the arbitrary conclusion of the debate, *i. e.*, a great part of the church was prevented from giving its testimony; the 13th of July came, which fixed the dissent (the non-agreement of the church) for all future times —a subsequent "submission" to the pope cannot annul this— the 17th and 18th of July came, with the following acts of violence. Was all this freedom or compulsion? What does your conscience say?

The problem which the council was to solve was a great one, if it had understood the times; for many centuries there were abuses in the church which needed to be rectified, but the rectification did not come. We are, at the present moment, in such a condition that every reflecting person must be horror-stricken when he sees the abyss toward which we are tending. An infamous moral principle has become prevalent among the younger clergy, the moral principle of the Jesuits, of the so-called "probability." The younger clergy have been led so far that they cleave to the letter, distinguish church commands which have not been given by the Church but by the hierarchy, place ecclesiastical commands on an equality with divine commandments, ascribe to them the same binding force and immutability as to the eternal commandments of God, which are made known by the voice of God in the conscience, and in the revelation of the Gospel. Here was an abundance of room for reformation. This Jesuitical moral causes mischief which is spread by means of the confessional, and which no one knows unless he has, like myself, sat for years in the confessional, and has seen how the conscience of the people has been disordered by it. Here there would have been great problems for a general council. Legends and fables run through the whole ritual; we celebrate the Saints' days of saints who never lived; legends have crept into the service of the mass, and the breviary of the clergy swarms with fables. Here was material enough on which a general council might have expended its labor. Archbishop Darboy, whom the Commune afterwards shot—one of the most cultivated and learned prelates in the Vatican council — wrote to the pope, and adjured him most solemnly to act magnanimously; to do the great deeds which the times demanded; to give them the reconciliation of faith and reason, of authority and freedom, of church and state.

And what has happened? The bishops were in session seven months, and what have they done? In two sessions they accomplished nothing, except doing unworthy reverence to the pope, a reverence which dishonors the bishop, if he knows that he himself is the successor of the apostles; in the third session they published a decretal concerning faith, which is entirely superfluous, unless it should have some meaning in a few ambiguous sentences; and, finally, the principal thing: "THEY HAVE INFALLIBLY DECLARED THROUGH THE COUNCIL THAT THE COUNCIL IS NOT INFALLIBLE." And we are now expected to believe the infallible utterances of a council that is not infallible. Many bishops struggled against it; one wrote, in his opinion, that would be suicide; a second said it was something unheard of; a third said: I will sooner die than accept such a thing. But the one has committed suicide, the second has heard it, and the third has not died. (Laughter.)

Let me only tell you briefly what this means, that the pope demands the sacrifice of our reason, that he wishes to determine our thinking, guide our acting, that he wishes to be our reason and our will. Every well-informed citizen knows that the welfare of states rests on knowledge and labor; knowledge in order to discern the proper ends to be sought after, and the means which lead thither; and labor, in order to reach these ends; and, under the influence of knowledge and labor, the powers of man unfold their most beautiful blossoms. But, if we sacrifice our reason and our freedom, how shall we acquire knowledge, and how shall we labor? We have a problem before us in the church, which we can also solve only by means of knowledge and labor; reason and freedom, under the control of grace, led by the voice of conscience; these are the talents which we have received from God, to trade with, and to bring to our Lord, as a result, the fruits of truth and righteousness. Reason and freedom are the manifestation of the image of God in our souls. The image of God has no significance at all, if it does not mean that we are exalted into a similitude to God. But, in order that this may be so, we must receive the light of the Divine Word, and the law of God, which is the law of conscience. Shall I now destroy the image of God in its manifestation, by saying: "The pope is my will, and he thinks for me?" How can I, in this case, solve my moral problem before God? The image in me demands that with my spirit I penetrate into the original beauty of God, in order that I may transform the natural man into the heavenly man, who is created in righteousness, in holiness, and truth. But I can do this only when I live in the spirit and not in the letter. For the word of God is spirit and life.

All authority which we are to receive as divine must rest upon our conscience; and it can do this only by means of the solid pillars of truth and justice. If the hierarchy itself breaks these pillars, if it wishes to dazzle our reason, and take away our freedom, then the consequence is that our conscience no longer serves as the foundation of such authority, and then authority itself sinks into the ground. Our conscience also demands eternal authority to guide us into the divine likeness; but this authority is no man of fear and terror, who holds in one hand the thunderbolt of excommunication from church and state, and in the other the match to the faggot. Once only the voice of God sounded out of resplendent glory: "This is my Son; hear Him!" When Christ taught, some said, "Our heart burnt within us, as he opened the Scriptures;" or, "He speaks as one having authority," and a woman for joy over his doctrine, called His mother blessed; thus His word penetrated to the heart, thus it harmonized with conscience. Men were not pointed to the only teacher of humanity in a moment when He appeared terrible, but in the hour of bliss. For when He was transfigured on the mountain, floating in sunny splendor before the eyes of the chosen disciples, when Elias appeared at His side as a sign that truth was no longer declared in images, but had appeared in person; and Moses on the other side as a sign that the law of fear had become powerless, and had been resolved into the law of love; when Christ shone so gloriously in the light of truth that Peter, quite enraptured, forgetting every thing else, cried out: "It is good for us to be here, let us build three tabernacles," and, for joy, thought not of himself: then it was that the Father, His Father and our Father called out of His resplendent glory: "Hear Him."

Yes, with this kind of authority, coming from without, we find the internal voice of God in sweetest harmony. He whom we shall hear as the Teacher of Truth, is the God of our conscience. Truth flows from His mouth like light, and the law of love writes upon the tablet of our hearts: "Him will we hear!"

Art. VIII.—REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, A. M., BERLIN, PA.

The order of salvation, or the subjective process by which the objective grace of Christ is appropriated, and salvation actualized in the individual man, includes a number of successive stages which are more or less distinct from each other. Among these Regeneration and Conversion are generally regarded as occupying a central, and, therefore, most important, place, though there is much difference of opinion in regard to the nature and significance of each, and in regard to the relation which they sustain to each other. Some would place conversion before regeneration; but we propose to discuss them in the order in which they are mentioned above, believing that the result will justify the adoption of this arrangement.

The presupposition of salvation is sin. Salvation is deliverance from sin and its consequences. Hence a correct understanding of the process of salvation presupposes a correct understanding of the nature and extent of sin. A Pelagian theory of sin, for example, leads necessarily to a false or defective theory of salvation. If the universality of sin were a consequence only of imitation; if it were true that individual men are now born without sin, and that they become sinners only when they begin to commit sin in thought, word and deed, which they learn to do simply by seeing others do the same; then salvation would evidently need to be nothing more than a process of outward reformation or improvement. The teaching of moral philosphy would then be as effective a means for the salvation of the world as the preaching of the gospel, and Socrates might be as good a Saviour as Christ. This, indeed, is the notion of many at the present time. They imagine that the power of sin may be broken, the reign of moral as well as physical evil abolished, and a golden age made to dawn upon the world, simply by mental and moral culture, by the dissipation of ignorance and superstition, by the education of the masses, by the cultivation and development of human nature as it is. Hence the world is full of novel schemes for the improvement of humanity—schemes that make no account of the Gospel, of Christ, the Church, the ministry and sacraments. Instead of the Church we have societies; instead of the ministry, masters and grand masters; instead of sacraments, regalia and passwords; instead of regeneration, pledges; instead of conversion, enlightenment; instead of sanctification, improvement. But unfortunately the depth and breath of the evil which is to be thus removed, are not understood; and the result, therefore, is always an aggravation of it rather than an amelioration.

Scripture and experience teach a very different theory of sin from that which underlies and conditions all these superficial notions of salvation. Sin is not contracted and propagated simply by education; neither can it be removed by education. Sin does not consist merely in a wrong way of thinking, feeling and volition, that we fall into somehow when we come to self-consciousness. Its beginning or root lies back of all self-consciousness, in the substance of our life itself. Our catechism teaches that we are "by *nature* prone to hate God and our neighbor," and hence *unable* to do that which God demands of us in His law. We do not become sinners only when we begin actually to transgress this law; on the contrary, we are sinners before we transgress, and we transgress *because* we are sinners. The proneness, tendency, impulse or bent to commit sin is in our nature from the very beginning of our individual existence; and the actual commission of sin, therefore, is but the legitimate outworking of what was in our nature, or in the substance of our life, before. The oak-tree does not become such only when it begins to produce acorns. It is an oak-tree from the earliest moment of its existence, because, though it has not yet borne acorns, it nevertheless possesses the nature and essential qualities of the oak; and therefore its fruit can never be anything else than acrid acorns. And thus it is with human nature. This is perverted, disordered, depraved, corrupt in its deepest ground, and therefore nothing good can come out of it.

And this corruption or depravity of human nature is the consequence of the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, inasmuch as (ἐφ' ᾧ) all have sinned," Rom. v. 12. "By the fall and disobedience of our first parents," says the Catechism, "our nature," that is not simply the nature of the individual, but our *generic human nature*, which lies back of the individual, and from which the individual proceeds in the way of generation, "has become so corrupt that we are all conceived and born in sin." Adam was not simply the federal, but the organic head of his race. His life, while it was individual, was at the same time also generic, bearing in itself the possibility of all the numberless individuals that have ever been, and that may yet be, born; in the same way that the acorn involves in itself the possibility of a developed tree, and of a whole forest of trees that may proceed from it. The character of Adam's life, therefore, determined the character of the life of his posterity. Adam's descendants, accordingly, have become sinners, not simply by the imputation of his guilt and the consequent withholding from them of original righteousness, nor by the imitation merely of his example, but by having proceeded out of the substance of his life both in respect of body and soul. We cannot enter here into the old dispute between Creationism and Traducianism; but we assume that the latter theory is in so far correct, that the human soul, as well as the body, is begotten, not in such sense, of course, that it could be said to be a *part* or offshoot (*tradux*) of the souls of the parents, by which these would be so much diminished, but nevertheless a *product* of the parental life, and not an original creation; for we believe that the doctrine of hereditary sin, so clearly taught in the Bible, is consistent only with some such theory as this. If an illustration be needed, we would refer to the manner in which Adam's own life is said originally to have proceeded from God. God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and thus he became a living soul. That life-breath, in our opinion, can not be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God; and yet it could not be said to be a *part* of God, in such sense that God's being would now be so much less than it was before. In the same way, no doubt, the soul of the child is an emanation from the souls of the parents, and receives its characteristic qualities and fundamental determinations from them. The act of generation involves, therefore, both soul and body. That which is generated, or begotten, is not body only, nor soul only, nor body and soul as separate entities to be joined together afterwards in the process of growth or development, but soul and body as comprehended germinally in the power and principle of one life. In its origin, in the *punctum saliens*, human life is one undivided power, containing in itself the possibility or germ both of soul and body, and these are actualized subsequently in the way of evolution or development. But here already is sin too, as a disordering, disorganizing, disintegrating force, and hence the whole process of development is abnormal. This abnormal character shows itself to some extent already in infancy, as no careful observer can fail to perceive, and becomes continually more manifest in proportion as the individual grows older. All the faculties and powers both of soul and body, as soon as they manifest themselves in the way of action, are found to be disordered. The will is perverted, and bent upon evil rather than good; the understanding is darkened; the desires and passions are wild and ungovernable; the feelings are troubled and painful; and the body carries within itself the seeds of disolution and death.

The evil lies, therefore, in the depths of our nature, at the very centre and root of our spiritual, psychical and physical life; and here also the remedy must begin. We can easily see that no merely outward reformation or improvement, no merely mental or moral culture, however complete and thorough it might be, would avail here. "The leprosy lies deep within," in the essence of our being, in that substantial ground from which all the faculties and powers of body and soul proceed; and, therefore, no process of salvation could be effective, that does not reach to this depth. A thorn-bush is not changed into a fig-tree by the pruning and trimming of its branches. The thorns might, indeed, be cut off and the bush made smooth; but in spite of this, its inward nature and life would remain the same as before, and the next year the thorns would grow out again, and the bush would become as horrid a thing as ever. So no sinner can be changed into a saint, no child of wrath converted into a child of God, by simply outward processes and appliances. What is needed here is a *Regeneration* or new spiritual birth. And it is plain too that this must be something more than that simply subjective change of heart or mind, which is so often made to pass for regeneration.

It is well known how much confusion reigns in the popular religious literature of the day, in sermons, tracts, Sunday-school books and religious journals, in regard to the meaning of the terms regeneration and conversion. By many they are wholly identified and used as convertible terms. Thus people are told continually and indiscriminately that they must be regenerated or converted; and this then is often explained to mean simply that men must experience a change of mind or heart, which they can do whenever they resolve to try. The change, in this view, is only a subjective process, involving merely the *way* of thinking, feeling and willing in regard to religion and divine things, which men are expected somehow to bring about themselves. The change is supposed to reach, not the faculties or organs of the soul themselves, much less the life in which these faculties are grounded, but only the way or form of their action. Instead of delighting in sin, men are to delight in righteousness; instead of loving the world, they are to love God; instead of groping in darkness and error, they are to know the truth; instead of willing that which is wrong, they are to will that which is good; but all this without any change in their nature, in which their feeling, intelligence and will are grounded, and by which the activity of these is determined and conditioned. But this is not regeneration. Such a process as this involves no mystery. A change of this kind Nicodemus could have understood well enough. Take a drunkard in one of his sober moments and reason with him. Tell him of the pernicious consequences of his vice. Remind him of the ruin which he is bringing upon himself and upon all who are dependent upon him. Arouse his feeling of self-respect, and make him to be ashamed of his past conduct. Paint to his imagination the loveliness and beauty of a sober and decent life. In this way you may cause him to become disgusted with his vice, and influence him to make up his mind that he will henceforth be a sober man. Here there is a moral change, but there is no mystery in it—except the mystery of rhetoric. It is a mental and moral process that is intelligible enough to the common understanding. And any other example would serve the purpose of illustration as well. Suppose a person who is indifferent to religion and unconcerned about his eternal destiny. Talk to him about the necessity of salvation. Describe to him the glory and blessedness of heaven, and paint to his fancy the horrors and torments of hell. He may thus perhaps be reasoned or persuaded into a change of mind. His thoughts, feelings, desires and purposes may be revolutionized; but this, whatever else it may be, is not regeneration. If our Lord had not meant something vastly more than this when He said, "Except a man be born aguin, he cannot see the kingdom of God," there would have been no reason certainly why Nicodemus should have been so much perplexed by His words.

Regeneration is a change produced by the Holy Spirit, not primarily in the sphere of consciousness, but in the substantial centre or ground of the human constitution itself. It is the production of a new life in the substance of the old. This is implied by the etymological signification of the word. Regeneration is the counterpart of generation. The latter is the process by which a human being is originated, consisting of soul and body, or according to the trichotomical view, which has its truth too, of *spirit*, soul and body, with definite qualities and determinations. Regeneration, on the other hand, is the process by which in this human being a new life is begotten, which, starting in the spirit, is destined in the way of development to renovate and transform the entire being. The expression "new birth," though often used in the same sense, is therefore, in its literal signification, not entirely equivalent to the term regeneration. They differ in the same proportion as the terms *generation* and *birth.* The term generation is more comprehensive than the term birth. Generation denotes the production or origination of a being of the same kind as that by which and in which it is originated; while birth is but the transition of this being from one stage of existence to another. The former term may be used sometimes so as to include the idea of the latter, but the latter is never used properly in the sense of the former. The Greek word for *birth* is γενεά or γενετή, as in John ix. 1, and the idea of *being born* is expressed by the verb τίκτω in the passive form, as in Matt. i. 23, Luke i. 31 and John xvi. 21. The more general idea of generation is expressed by γέννησις, from the verb γεννᾷν, the proper signification of which is *to beget, to engender, to produce.* In the New Testament, indeed, this latter verb is not seldom used in such an extended signification as to include the idea of *being born* or *brought forth,* as in John viii. 41, and also John ix. 2 and 34; but the passages are few in which the latter idea is the exclusive, or even the predominant, signification. Γεννηθῆναι then signifies *to be begotten,* or *to be generated.* And this is the word used, either in connection with other modifying words, or in connection with the preposition ἀνά, to express the verbal idea of regeneration. The former usage is that which prevails in the writings of St. John. So in the Gospel, iii. 3: "Except one be begotten from above (μή τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν) he cannot see the kingdom of God; which idea (of being begotten from above) is then, verse 5, further defined by the addition of "water and Spirit." In the first epistle the same idea is expressed by the phrase γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεου; as, for example, "whosoever is begotten (γεγεννημένος) of God does not commit sin." Compare also iv. 7, vi. 1, 4 and 18. St. Peter uses the compound verb ἀναγεννηθῆναι. So in the first Epistle, i. 3, ἀναγεννήσας, where our translators have rendered correctly "begotten;" and verse 23 of the same chapter, *ἀναγεγεννημένοι*, where the English version reads "born again," though there is no reason why it should not have been rendered by the same word as in the *third* verse. From this verb was formed afterwards, in ecclesiastical Greek, the noun *ἀναγέννησις*, which, however, does not occur in the New Testament. St. Paul once uses the analogous noun *παλιγγενεσία* (washing of regeneration, Tit. iii. 5), which is the literal equivalent of the Latin-English word *regeneration.* The same word is also used in Matt. xix. 28, where however it denotes the resurrection and glorification of the last day, implying that the final glorification of the saints, and the consequent glorification of the world too, are but the full efflorescence of the process begun in regeneration.

Regeneration, accordingly, is the production or origination of a *principle* of new life in the substantial core of human personality. The agent by which this is accomplished is the Holy Ghost. Man can not regenerate himself, as he can change his mind, his feelings, views and purposes. His regeneration can be as little the product of his own activity, as his carnal conception and birth, or his natural generation. In the act by which a new life is begotten within him the subject is required to be wholly passive, or at least purely receptive. He can not contribute anything towards the change, either by his own operation or co-operation, but can only quietly and silently suffer it to be wrought within him. Anything like *synergism* in the work of regeneration is entirely out of the question. Hence also it is required of adults, Matt. xviii. 3, that they become as little children in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven; which kingdom, according to John iii. 5, can only be entered by being begotten of water and Spirit. "Except ye be converted (*στραφῆτε*) and become as little children," says our Lord here to adults, "ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." In the case of a little child, sin though present as a perverting force, is still in the minimum of its energy. It is a slumbering power, that has not yet attained sufficient strength to resist the impression of divine grace, or interpose a bar in the way of its operation. Hence the little child, though a sinful being, and as such not actually in the kingdom of heaven, is nevertheless susceptible to the regenerating, quickening influence of the Holy Spirit, and capable of thus entering into that kingdom. No previous mental and moral preparation is necessary, as in the case of adults, to fit the child for the reception of the grace of regeneration. To suppose the contrary would be to make the grace of Christ less comprehensive in its operations than sin, while we are told by St. Paul that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." This could not be true, certainly, if the whole infant world were shut out from regenerating grace, as all sorts of Baptists, and some too who are not Baptists, would have us believe. An infinitely better and worthier view of the scope of Christ's grace is that expressed by Irenæus in the often quoted passage: "He came to save all through Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord." The unconscious passivity of the age of infancy, therefore, instead of being an obstacle in the way of regenerating grace, is in fact the very best condition for the reception of that grace, and hence the adult must, by an act of self-negation, reduce himself to the passive state of a child, in order that he may be able to receive the same, and so enter into the kingdom of heaven. For the adult sin is no longer merely a slumbering power; on the contrary, it has become a developed force. It has taken possession of the will, the affections and thoughts, and has given them all a perverse bent or bias. The *habit* of the whole personality has become fixed in a sinful form; and this fixed habit presents a barrier to the work of regenerating grace, which must be broken down and taken out of the way, before this grace can become operative. An abnormally or sinfully developed personality is no longer passive, like the child, over against the influence of regenerating grace. But it must become so again in order that this grace may be able to accomplish its work within it. In this sense the adult must again become as a child in order to regeneration and entrance into the kingdom of heaven. We can think of no better illustration of the condition required here than the spiritual state of the Virgin Mary, when she answered to the salutation of the angel: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word." Mary's will in no sense co-operated in the production of the mystery within her womb; but we can easily see how, if it had been adverse, it might have prevented the mystery so far as her person was concerned. Her state was one of receptive passivity, and that was the condition required in order that the Holy Ghost might come upon her, and that the power of the Highest might overshadow her. And a similar state of passivity is required now in order to the production of the mystery of regeneration in the individual soul. This seems to be what St. John means when he says of Christ, that "as many as *received* Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born (or *begotten*, εγεννήθησαν), not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." No adult sinner, however, could bring himself into this state of receptive passivity simply by the exertion of his own will. There is necessary, in order that he may be able to do this, what in the theology of Augustine is called *prevenient*, in distinction from *operative* or regenerating, grace; which may be defined, in a general way, as the activity of the Spirit of the Father drawing to the Son.

But while the Holy Ghost is the agent in the work of regeneration, as above said, He is not the originator of that new life which He therein communicates to the human soul. He does not create it *de nihilo* just before planting it in the soul. The Spirit is not the *author*, but the *giver* of life; and the life which He gives is that of Christ, the exalted and glorified God-man. Christ is the sole fountain of spiritual life for the whole human race. It is scarcely necessary to quote texts in proof of this proposition. All those passages, however, would be in point here, in which Christ is called, or calls Himself, *the life*, the *bread of life*, the *resurrection* and *the life*, *the way*, *the truth*, and *the life*, which are numerous, especially in the Gospel of St. John. The same thought is implied also by the contrast in which St. Paul places Christ to Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 22 and 45. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." "And so it is written, The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a *quickening spirit*." Christ is the Second or Last Adam. The first Adam is the source of life for the race physically and psychically. Men are derived from Adam, *the* man, in the way of natural generation; and for this reason also they are all sinners; since "that which is born of the flesh," or derived from a stock whose life is corrupt and weak, "is flesh," that is, corrupt and weak also, and can never of itself become anything else. Christ, on the other hand, is the source of life for the race spiritually. He was made a quickening Spirit. In this respect, as in others, the race is reheaded in Him. He stands in the same relation to it spiritually, at least in so far as it is regenerated and saved, that Adam stands to it naturally. As by natural generation men become partakers of the natural, sinful life of Adam, so by regeneration they become partakers of the spiritually glorified life of Christ; as by natural generation they become partakers of *human* nature, so by regeneration they "become partakers of the *divine* nature," 2 Pet. i. 4, which does not mean simply a moral resemblance, an ideal communion, but a real communion of being with God in Christ. This is not Pantheism, or if it is, it is St. Peter that is guilty of it. It does not mean, however, that any part of Christ's *individual* or *personal* being is by regeneration infused into His people, in such way that His own being would be diminished by the process. We have already seen that the derivation of man's life from God in the beginning, or the derivation of the child's life from that of the parent, requires no such conception. God did not breathe a part of Himself into man's nostrils, in order to make him a living soul; although what He did breathe into him was an emanation from Himself, and not a created element. So no part of the parent's individual personal being passes over into the child, and yet the child as to its whole constitution is a product of the parents' life. In like manner the life of regeneration is an emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine-human-life, and yet no sensible or material part of His personal being. As an illustration of this relation between Christ and His regenerate people, we may refer to the influence of the sun upon the life of vegetation on our planet; bearing in mind, however, the old adage, *omne simile claudicat.* It is well known that the green color of plants, for example, is produced by the influence of the sun's light. If a plant be caused to germinate and grow in a dark place, it will be pale and sickly; but the moment it is removed into the light, its color will begin to change and the whole plant will seem to be endowed with new life. The sun exists at a vast distance from the earth: and yet from it, and in connection with its rays, there goes out a mysterious power or influence, which lodges itself in the plant's life and imparts to it new qualities, a new tone and character; *and yet in this process the sun loses no particle or atom of its own matter.* The process is purely dynamical. And so now there goes out from Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, a new spiritual principle of life, which lodges itself in the centre of the human soul, imparting to it a new character, breaking the power of sin and producing new qualities and attributes within it. This is regeneration. We must observe, however, that the new life thus lodged in man is not to be regarded as holding in separation from Christ after it has come to exist in the human soul. On the contrary it forms a perpetual bond of union between Christ and the soul; so that the soul is in Christ as the branch is in the vine, or as the members of the human body are in the body. "Ye in me, and I in you"—that expresses the relation subsisting between Christ and His people from the moment of their actual regeneration. The *unio mystica*, according to Reformed Theology, is not first formed by means of the Eucharist, nor does it begin in conversion or during the process of sanctification; but it is to be regarded as the direct and immediate concomitant of regeneration.

The objective medium or instrumental cause of regeneration, according to Scripture and the ancient faith of the Church, is the Sacrament of Baptism. When our Lord first speaks of regeneration to Nicodemus, He connects it with water and Spirit. And St. Paul's "washing of regeneration," (Tit. iii. 5,) is by the Heidelberg Catechism and the great majority of commentators considered as identical with baptism. That regeneration is once ascribed to the *Gospel*, as in 1 Cor. iv. 15, and several times to the *Word* ("word of truth," James i. 18, and "word of God," 1, Pet. i. 23), can easily be harmonized with the common doctrine of the Church, when we bear in mind the peculiar sense in which these terms are used in the New Testament. By *word* we commonly understand merely the *name* of a thing, as a sound of the voice, or the expression of an idea, which we regard as an abstraction only of the mind. But the Hebrew דָבָר and the Greek *λόγος* denote *the objective matter* or *thing itself*, as any one will see who will take the trouble to consult Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon. Hence the term *word* in the New Testament sometimes denotes Christ Himself, and sometimes the substantial realities of that world of grace and truth which proceeds from Christ as its centre and ground, and which forms the objective contents of the Gospel, as well as the inward substance and life of the Church. Even the most common view of baptism makes it to be the rite of initiation into the Church, which would not be a bad definition of the sacrament, provided we bear in mind always the true nature of the Church. The Church, says St. Paul, is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. If we make earnest of this thought, as we are bound to do, and do not destroy all its force by unscriptural and unwarranted distinctions of *visible* and *invisible* churches, then to become a member of the Church is at the same time to become a member of Christ and partaker of His life; for Christ's life is by the Holy Ghost infused into the Church, and that is just what makes it to be a living organism or body. The grace of regeneration, therefore, does not come immediately and directly from heaven; as the Baptist preachers of Boston must imagine, who *resolved* lately that baptism consists in the immersion in water of a *regenerate* believer. It comes from heaven indeed, from Christ, the exalted Head of the Church, but it comes through the Church and holds within the Church. Men are not regenerated by the Holy Spirit on the outside of the Church, and then brought into it for preservation; but they are regenerated by being incorporated with, or ingrafted into, the Church through the sacrament of baptism, which was ordained as an organ of the Church for this purpose. As the human body by means of organs adapted for the purpose, lays hold of materials belonging to a lower order of existence, receives them into itself, and then assimilates them to itself as parts of its own constitution by communicating to them its own qualities and properties; so the Church by means of its organs lays hold upon the world of sinful humanity, takes this up into itself, as far as it suffers itself to be thus taken up, and regenerates and sanctifies it by communicating to it the supernatural life which is at hand in its own bosom. For this reason, no doubt, the new birth is connected inseparably with an entrance in the Kingdom of God. The Scriptural idea of the Church may not be identical in all regards with the idea of the kingdom of God; and yet so much is certain, that in as far as this kingdom exists in the world at all, it exists only in the bosom of the Church; and hence no one can be in the former without being in the latter. The entrance into it, however, is by regeneration, or by being begotten from above, that is, by the power of a life reaching down from this supernatural kingdom itself through the ordinance of baptism consisting of water and Spirit. As by natural generation we come to have an existence in the world of nature, by whose forces and powers we are continually surrounded; so by regeneration we come to have an existence in the kingdom of grace, and are thenceforth surrounded by, and brought into contact with, the powers of the heavenly world; or as St. Paul says, "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

The immediate effect of regeneration is *justification.* Justification does not consist in the infusion of a foreign righteousness, in the sense of the Romish Church, which identifies it with sanctification; nor is it merely a *forensic* act of imputation, in the sense of modern Puritanism. It consists in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but *on the ground* of that vital union with Christ, which is formed in regeneration. We can not think of regeneration and justification as being separate in time. As soon as the sinner comes to be a member of Christ, and partaker of His life, the Father views him no longer as he is in consequence of his natural birth and relation to Adam, but as he is in consequence of his relation to Christ. Christ's righteousness covers, in the sight of the Father, the sins of His members. In Christ, the only begotten Son, the Father has declared Himself to be forever well pleased; and that good pleasure of the Father extends not only to Christ the Head, but also to His members. We may define justification, therefore, as that act of God the Father, whereby He accounts us as just for the sake of Christ's merits, and on the ground of our vital union with Christ. We thus preserve the truth underlying the forensic theory, for he who is justified still knows himself to be personally without *merit;* and at the same time also the truth underlying the Romish theory, for justification is not a mere fiction in the mind of God.

The indispensable subjective condition of justification, however, is *faith.* According to the whole New Testament, but especially St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, the sinner is justified by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. Even the objective vital union with Christ, or, which is the same thing, Christ's indwelling in the soul, is said to hold, on the subjective side, in the element or bond of faith. Christ Himself says, John vi. 47, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that *believeth* on me, hath everlasting life." St. Paul says, Gal. ii. 20, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh *I live by the faith of the Son of God;*" and for the Ephesians he prays, iii. 17, "that Christ may dwell in their hearts *by faith.*" But if justification, and by implication regeneration also, are thus conditioned by faith, how then can the unconscious infant be regenerated and justified? This, as all know, is a question that spoils much of our theology at this point. The Baptist has a short and easy answer. Assuming that the infant is incapable of faith, he holds that it ought not to be baptized. And many who are not willing to adopt the Baptist's conclusion, nevertheless adopt his assumption, generally without examining it, and thereby involve themselves in difficulties and inconsistencies on every hand. Thus a difference is often made between what, it is supposed, baptism may accomplish in the case of believing adults, and what it may accomplish in the case of unconscious infants; so that for adults the sacrament would be one thing, and for infants another. True the Scriptures make no such difference. St. Paul says to the Galatians: For as *many* of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." In the previous sentence he says: "Ye are all the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus." And he connects the two sentences by the causal conjunction "for," thus showing that he regards their sonship through faith as the effect of their having put on Christ by baptism. But what we wish to call attention to especially is the universality of the statement, *as many of you.* There is no limitation, distinction, or qualification. So also in Romans vi. 3, "Know ye not, that so *many* of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death?" But a certain class of commentators will tell us that the persons baptized in the apostolic age were generally adults, who received baptism at their own request and desire, and who were at once able to exercise the act of conscious faith, in whose case the sacrament, of course, secured the grace of regeneration; but that afterwards, when infant baptism became the rule and adult baptism the exception, the case was changed. The sacrament, according to this view, was at first designed only for adults, and in their case it answered its purpose very well; but afterwards, when infant baptism became general, as it did immediately after the age of the apostles, as soon as the Church was established and Christian families secured, it was found to be no longer applicable in the same form and character as before, and had to be so modified as to make it a sign only of the grace of regeneration, to be communicated subsequently in some other way. The sacrament, then, has degenerated since the time of the apostles, and has now no longer the same efficacy and force that it had then. If this notion were correct, then we could not expect to learn from the New Testament what baptism is *now*, but only what it was long ago, and there would be at least one subject in reference to which the Bible would no longer be a sufficient rule of faith. Now we grant, of course, that the first subjects of baptism were adults; but we hold, nevertheless, that it was the will of Christ from the beginning that infant baptism should become the rule in the Church, that baptism is a sacrament especially for infants. Circumcision was administered to Abraham when he was ninety years old and nine, but his descendants were commanded to be circumcised on the eighth day. We believe, therefore, that infant baptism is the normal practice, corresponding to the mind and will of the Lord, and that it confers upon the infant now no less than it ever conferred upon any adult baptized in the apostolic age. At any rate, the grace conferred in either case is the same in *principle.* There is, therefore, no difference between adult baptism and infant baptism; on the contrary every baptism is *essentially* infant baptism, for the adult even must become as a little child in order rightly to receive it.

But if this be true, then the assumption upon which the Baptists' rejection of infant haptism and this notion of a modification of baptism are based, must be given up as false. Can an unconscious infant then have faith? The old Reformed theologians, from Calvin downwards, answered this question in the *affirmative.* For quotations see Ebrard's Dogmatics, § 455. The tendency now is strong to answer it in the *negative.* And the only argument in favor of this view commonly is the question, *How* can an unconscious infant believe? To which it might perhaps be enough to reply, "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamed of in your philosophy." Does not our Lord, in Matt. xviii. 6, attribute faith to little children? We know the passage is commonly made to refer to such big children as Peter and the rest of the apostles then were; but let any one read it once without the pre-supposition that little children are not *capable* of faith, and see whether it will not also yield another and a profounder sense. The disciples came to Jesus saying, Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? And He called a little child (*Παιδίον*) unto Him, and placed it in the midst of them; and then after telling them that they must be converted and become as little children in order to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, He continued, "Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child, (not simply an adult who has humbled himself and become *as* a child, but a literal child like that which stood in the midst of the disciples at the time) in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of *these little ones that believe in me*, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck," etc. "These little ones that believe in me"—who would ever have supposed this, in the connection in which it stands, to refer to others than children in the literal sense, if it were not for the difficulty of understanding *how* they can believe? But even that may be owing to our present defective philosophy of faith, rather than to any particular difficulty in the thing itself.

Let it be borne in mind that the question here is concerning *justifying* faith, which is not a product of nature but of grace, being wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost, and in this sense a gift of God. Justifying faith, therefore, is not before regeneration and in order to regeneration, but the effect of regeneration, the activity of a regenerate soul. Such faith is a *direct* sense and apprehension of the supernatural and divine or of Christ, and is possible only in consequence of an immediate union of subject and object; as the sense of vision is possible only in consequence of an immediate union of the eye with its object, light. Faith, accordingly, is not knowledge, or a product of reflection; on the contrary, it precedes knowledge and is in order to reflection. If faith were merely a determination of the intellectual faculty, a conviction, or conscious holding for truth, after full inquiry and examination of that which God has revealed to us in His written Word, then of course the infant would not be capable of it, so long as its consciousness is undeveloped. But faith is an activity of the *heart.* "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." And the heart, in the Scriptural sense, as all know, is the centre of the whole human constitution, the focus from which all the energies and faculties of the soul diverge, and to which they again converge, that which we commonly call personality. But the essence or substance of this is not consciousness, reflection or thought, but *will*, which is at first a simple energy or force, involving in itself, however, the possibility of conscious volition and thought, as the seed involves the possibility of the plant with its leaves and flowers. The essence of man, say the profoundest modern psychologists, is not *thought* but *will.* In its natural state, however, the will, thus forming the root or essence of personality, has a tendency which is averse to God and His law; and that is sin. This tendency exists previously to the development of consciousness; for the will is never undetermined or indifferent in reference to good and evil; else it would be a mere force of nature. In reference to the highest interest of its being the will of the child is determined before it determines itself. Its will has a tendency towards evil before it knows what evil is, a tendency which it has not given itself, but which, as we have just said, exists previously to the development of consciousness. And certainly this tendency can also be changed by divine grace previously to the development of consciousness. As the roots of a plant in a dry soil spontaneously turn in the direction of moisture, or as the tendrils of the vine reach towards and fasten themselves upon a supporting object, so may and must the unconscious will, or heart, of the infant, which is abnormal and uncomfortable in its isolation or separation from God, turn towards Christ and fasten itself upon Him whenever He is brought into felt contact with it by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

But such an immediate *sense* and *apprehension* of Christ as this implies, is nothing other than the essence of justifying faith. Why should this be supposed to be impossible before the development of consciousness? Is it not antecedent to consciousness or reflection even in the adult? The knowledge or reflective certitude of the relation which comes to exist between the soul and Christ by means of the soul's direct act apprehending Christ, is of course impossible without consciousness; but not for that reason the act of apprehension and the relation itself, as this must in all cases precede such knowledge or certitude. Must I not be one with Christ before I can know myself to be one with Him? Must I not believe in Christ before I can know that I believe in Him? Plainly the knowledge here can not precede the *sense* of union with Christ, but must follow it as effect follows cause. We are directly related to the natural world by means of natural sense. Sense brings us into immediate contact, or in felt relation, to the world; and this is the indispensable condition of all conscious perception and of all reflective knowledge of the world. Sense precedes knowledge. We see and hear before we know that we do so, and before we know what seeing or hearing is. Sensation awakens reflection, not reflection sensation. And so now we are directly related to the supernatural world, or to God in Christ, by *faith*. Faith discloses to us the supernatural, as sense discloses the natural world. Here faith is the indispensable condition of knowledge. We believe in order that we may know, not the reverse. This does not mean, of course, that knowledge may not react upon faith, and thus serve to intensify and strengthen it; as science also reacts upon sensation and teaches us how to use our senses to the best advantage; but it does mean that the genesis of faith must be antecedent to the genesis of knowledge. And why then should it be supposed, especially in the case of the infant, that the capacity for faith must be measured by the capacity for knowledge? If this supposition were correct, then our own faith would stop whenever our knowledge stops. In the unconsciousness of sleep or of disease, the believer would no longer be a believer, and then Christ would cease to dwell in his heart. Faith as to its essence is an *actus directus* of the soul, whereby this lays hold of and fixes itself upon Christ, and which, therefore, is what it is whether we know it or not. And we are justified by *faith*, by that *actus directus*, and not by our *knowledge* of faith, or by that *actus reflexus*, by which we know and are certain that we do believe. And now of that *actus directus* we hold that the regenerate infant is capable no less than the adult. For a fuller discussion of this subject we refer to *Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology*, v. § 4, where the same conclusion is reached that we have come to here.

It will be understood, of course, that we do not ignore or undervalue the benefit flowing to the child from the faith of its Christian parents. That the faith of parents may become a medium of blessing to their children we can see from many examples in the New Testament. To the woman of Canaan, whose daughter was grievously vexed with a devil, and who, though not a descendant of Abraham, nevertheless addressed the Lord by His Messianic title and besought Him to help her, He answered at last, "O woman, great is *thy* faith; be it unto thee as thou wilt. And her *daughter* was made whole from that very hour." To that father who brought his demoniac son, first to the disciples, and then to Jesus, and cried out in an agony bordering on despair, "If Thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us," Jesus replied, "If *thou canst believe*, all things are possible unto them that believe." And then, when the father cried out again and said with tears, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," Jesus rebuked the foul spirit, and it came out of the son. In these and similar cases the faith of parents became the bridge, so to speak, for the passing over of the healing power of Christ into the persons of their children. And in the case of the Centurion of Capernaum we see how the faith of the master resulted, in the same way, to the benefit of his servant. To him also the Lord said, "Go thy way; and as *thou* hast believed, so be it unto thee. And his *servant* was healed in the self-same hour." And so now the faith of Christian parents forms in some sense a medium for the communication of the grace of regeneration to their children in the sacrament of baptism; and hence the Church can only baptize infants on condition that they have Christian parents, or sponsors who desire baptism for them. But this parental faith cannot be justifying faith for the child. It is related to this somewhat as prevenient grace is related to regenerating grace, serving to prepare the child for the reception of the latter; but with the reception of this latter, that is, with the reception of a principle of new life, we hold that it receives also the capacity for faith. At any rate there must be at once such an inward conjunction of that new life with the child's incipient personality, as implies an immediate and spontaneous sense and apprehension of the former by the latter. Some, indeed, may not choose to call this faith; but whatever it be called, we are convinced that it is identical with faith in its fundamental essence, and that it is the root from which *conscious* faith subsequently grows forth.

In the act of regeneration, according to what has now been said, the child is delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of Christ, Col. i. 13-20. It now belongs to Christ; it is a member of Christ, and stands in a direct, immediate or felt relation to Christ and His kingdom. Of this relation, however, it is at first *unconscious.* As the tendril is unconscious of the object around which it has twined, or as the infant is unconscious of the mother at whose breast it is nourished, so the regenerate child is, in the first moment at least, unconscious of Christ upon whom its soul has become inwardly fixed. A time, however, arrives when it must become conscious of this relation and of all that it involves, a time when by an act of self-determination it must take up the relation into its subjective life or into the processes of its mind, and when it must freely choose to abide in it and live in conformity to it. This change or transition of the life of grace from the objective essence or nature of personality into the sphere of consciousness or mind we denominate *Conversion.*

The noun *conversion* (ἐπιστροφή) occurs only once in the

New Testament, namely, Acts xv. 3, where, however, it is used as a general term to denote the transition of persons from heathenism to Christianity. The verb (ἐπιστρέφω) in its various forms is used nine times, but not always in the same sense. Our Lord uses it several times to denote the mental and moral process through which adult Jews, whose life and character were contrary to the true spirit of Judaism, must pass in order to be able to enter into the kingdom of heaven. One of the passages in which the word is thus used, we have already examined. St. Peter uses it in the same sense, in Acts iii. 19, where he exhorts the murderous Jews, who had killed the "Prince of life," if not directly, at least indirectly, so that they were all guilty of the great crime, to repent and be *converted*, in order that their sins might be blotted out. In James v. 19, it denotes the recovering or return of a Christian who has erred from the truth—the coming back of an apostate. But in none of the senses in which the word is used in the New Testament can conversion be regarded as a universal requirement in order to salvation. Nathanael, an Israelite in whom there was no guile, and John, who no sooner saw the Lord than he followed Him, needed not to be converted like those hostile Jews who had consented to, or taken part in Christ's crucifixion. Polycarp who served Christ eighty and six years and never erred from the truth, and Baxter who knew no time when he did not love the Lord, needed no conversion like the apostate heretics referred to by St. James. And persons baptized in infancy and growing up in the communion of the Church can need no conversion like the Gentiles. And yet it would sound strange now to hear it said that salvation is possible, in the case of any adult, or that any one can be a true Christian, without conversion. In the modern theological sense of the term, which is, however, not precisely the Scriptural sense, conversion is still a universal requirement in order to salvation.

In the Heidelberg Catechism (Ques. 88,) the term conversion is used as the equivalent of the Scriptural term *repentance*, (μετάνοια), and defined as "the mortification of the old, and the quickening of the new man." So also in the Augsburg

Confession (Art. xii.) where the two parts of repentance *or* conversion are said to be contrition and faith. And this has now come to be the sense in which the term conversion is most generally used. *Μετάνοια* is literally a *change of mind.* It is a subjective process—a conscious and voluntary operation of the mind itself. Hence men are *commanded* to repent. It is not a process in which men are simply passive, as in regeneration. In the New Testament men are never exhorted to regenerate themselves, while they are continually exhorted to repent. This is something which they must do themselves, and which they also can do, although not without the assistance of divine grace. Conversion or repentance, accordingly, in the Scriptural sense of the latter term, is an activity of the mind by which .this consciously and voluntarily places itself into right relation to God and divine things—an activity by which the mind renounces the enmity against God, which is of the flesh, and puts itself into subjection to the law of God.

If it be asked why such an act is necessary in the case of a regenerate person, the essential core of whose personality is already fixed upon Christ, and pervaded more or less by the power of Christ's life, or "by the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" we may answer that salvation, while it is the work of God, must, at the same time, be also a work of human freedom. No man is saved against his will. To the commencement of the work of grace within him he can, indeed, not contribute anything. Here grace alone is operative. But afterwards, a moment must arrive when he is bound to co-operate with this grace, in order that it may reach its proper end. Adam was created in righteousness and true holiness. His will was in a right state or condition. We cannot conceive of will as mere force, without any moral determination. Such will would not differ from a mere force of nature; from the force of gravity, for example, or the spontaneity of the brute; in fact, it would not be will. Here probably is the truth underlying the dogma of a *donum supernaturale* in the case of Adam. His will, or moral faculty, was not indifferent to good and evil—not in a state of utter indetermination or indecision

—not a mere power of self-determination. Only the dogma must be regarded as false in as far as it regards the supernatural gift, the positive determination of the will, as something brought in or superadded subsequently to the creation, and therefore not belonging to the proper being of man; as though God had, at first, for awhile left him without it, in order to see what he would make of himself, and then, when He found that the poor creature could not make anything, come to his assistance with the supernatural gift. Adam in the first moment of his creation was endowed with the power of will, in a state of positive determination in reference to the good, or to God and His law. And yet that will, which was substantially good from the beginning, was required to determine *itself* also in reference to God's will or law, and thus to be good by its own choice. What Adam was substantially from the beginning, that he was required subsequently to make himself by a conscious act of his own freedom; which, however, he failed to do, not through want of ability, or because God, for a wise purpose, deprived him again of his original righteousness, but "through the instigation of the devil and his own *wilful* disobedience." So now, in the case of the regenerate person, a time must come when he is required to make himself, by his own free act, what he already is by divine grace; a time when he must become conscious of his deliverance from the power of the devil, of his own gracious relation to God and His kingdom, and of God's holy law, and when he must consciously and freely resolve to abide in that relation and to live in obedience to that law. He can only do that, of course, in consequence of that regenerating grace, which has already principially broken the power of sin within him, and delivered him from its bondage; or, as St. Paul says: "freed him from the law of sin and death," and thus restored to him the full and free use of his own will. And when he has done it, then we say he is *converted*. In the case of persons baptized as adults, this subjective act of conversion may coincide in time with the objective act of regeneration. But, in the case of infants, the two acts must necessarily be more or less separated in time; and this is the normal order, unless infant baptism is an unwarranted innovation contrary to the will of the Lord; and it is with the normal order of salvation, as it holds in the Church, that we have now to do, and not with any possible exceptions to it.

The Heidelberg Catechism is evidently constructed after the idea of this order. The Catechism is not a book designed for the children of Pagans and Baptists, but for the children of the Church. The baptized child of the Church is at once recognized as a child of God, and as belonging to Christ. The Catechism does not begin, as some suppose it ought, by telling the child what it must do in order to become a Christian, and in order to obtain the forgiveness of sin, and deliverance from the power of the devil. The child is a Christian. It belongs not to itself but to Christ, with body and soul, both in life and in death. It has been delivered from the power of the devil, and is now not a child of wrath, but of grace. But now it is to become conscious of all this. It is to learn to understand what it all means. Here it finds itself existing in an order of grace, surrounded by gracious powers and influences, into which it has come in a way unknown to itself, and at a time of which it remembers nothing. But now it is to be taught how this has come to pass, and how much it means. "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou in this comfort mayest live and die happy? Answer: Three things—First, the greatness of my sin and misery. Second, how I am (not *may be*, which is a false translation of the German *werde*) redeemed from all my sins and misery. Third, how I am to be thankful to God for such redemption." In other words: The Christian child is now to become conscious of that kingdom of evil from which it has been delivered, and of the negative relation in which it has thus been brought to stand to it; and of that kingdom of grace in which it has its present being, and whose blessings and benefits it is now enjoying; and, finally, of the attitude or bearing which it must assume in reference to both, in order that it may continue to enjoy the comfort which is now its own. It is now by an exercise of its own mind and will to renounce, and turn away from, sin and the devil, on the one hand, which is *penitence*, or repentance in the narrower sense; and, on the other hand, it is to turn unto God in Christ, to confess Him, to accept and own Him, together with all His benefits, which is conscious or developed *faith*. And these two together, namely, penitence and faith, in their interaction, form the essence of conversion.

We may compare the genesis of conversion to the genesis of the natural consciousness. By its natural generation and birth the infant comes to exist in the bosom of the world of nature. There exists at once a reciprocal relation between its own physical being and the forces and powers of nature by which it is surrounded. These act upon it and impress it; they nourish it and minister to its growth and development. And this they can do only because there is something akin, an inward correspondence between the life of man and the life of nature. But the child knows nothing of this relation. The light shines into its eyes, sounds strike its ears, objects touch its body, it sees, hears and feels, but it does not distinguish between the objects of its sensations and these sensations themselves, and therefore has no perceptions. It stands in a felt relation to the world, and has a sense of the world, but it has no consciousness of it. But this condition can not last always. The child's mind is growing. Its consciousness is developing in contact with the physical, mental and moral world by which it is surrounded. Gradually it begins to distinguish between itself and the objects of its sensations, and thus it begins to have perceptions. It becomes conscious of the world as an order of things distinct from itself, but to which it must now place itself in a free, self-chosen relation. Its previous passive, or merely felt, relation must give place to an active or conscious relation. It must penetrate the world by reflection; it must learn to distinguish between that which is beneficial and that which is hurtful, and it must by its voluntary activity appropriate the former and abstain from the latter. So now with the genesis of the Christian consciousness, or with the process of conversion. The Christian child exists in a world of grace. There is an inward felt relation between its own spiritual being and the forces and powers of this world of grace, which impress it through the constitution of the Christian family and especially through the ordinances of the Church. But at first this relation is *only* felt. The child has no knowledge of it. If, however, it be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, according to the Apostle's injunction, the child will gradually become conscious of it. It will become conscious of God in Christ—which is something different from the *general* consciousness of God, as the heathen have this too. It will become conscious of the kingdom of God, but at the same time also of a kingdom which is the opposite of this, namely the kingdom of Satan; for the former exists in the midst of the latter and is everywhere surrounded by it; just as in the regenerate person itself the "new man" exists still within the "old." And between these two now, namely between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, the child is compelled to make a voluntary choice, although as to its inward being it already stands in the bosom of the former. It must by its own free decision make itself what it already is in consequence of God's objective grace. Its direct or spontaneous faith, the inward rapport between its soul and Christ, must become self-conscious or intelligent faith; it must come to *know* that it believes and what it believes. And so on the other hand, the negative relation in which it has thus far stood to sin unconsciously, must now be taken up into its consciousness. It must learn to know sin as something both hurtful to itself and displeasing to God, and indeed as something hurtful to itself *because* displeasing to God. Hence also it must come to hate sin and turn from it with all the energy of its soul. And finding that, although now justified and in favor with God, sin nevertheless has an existence still in the periphery of its own nature, that it is therefore still a sinful being, and in thought, word and deed continually offends, it must now be filled with penitence or sincere and godly sorrow. Penitence, however, must bloom into confession of sin and renunciation of the flesh, the world and the devil; while faith, on the other hand, must bloom into a confession of Christ, or into a profession of the articles of our Catholic, undoubted Christian Faith. And here now the Church meets the subject with *confirmation*, in which he on his part renews and ratifies the promise and vow made in his baptism; whilst the Church, in God's stead, claims him publicly for the service of God, blesses him in the name, and confirms him in the covenant of God, invoking upon him in larger measure the Holy Ghost, by whose help alone he may be able to fulfill his vows by leading a holy and obedient life.

The Heidelberg Catechism makes no distinction between conversion and sanctification, as is commonly done in modern Theological works. It uses the term sanctification as a designation for the entire process or order of salvation, or for the whole work of the Spirit in the appropriation of the grace of Christ to the individual soul through the Church. Conversion then it regards as a process reaching from the moment of regeneration forward to the end of the Christian's life on earth; and this process, as we have already seen, it defines to be "the mortification of the old, and the quickening of the new man." The expression old and new man is derived from St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians and Colossians. In regeneration the personality is centrally and principially renewed, but the law of sin still exists in the periphery of its nature, so that the appetites, desires, inclinations and passions are still more or less under its dominion. This is that "law of sin in the members," warring against the law of the spiritually renewed mind, or against the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which has become the determining principle of the mind. Here there is a conflict. The old and the new are contrary to each other. But the old is to be more and more absorbed by the new, or converted into the new, in such way however that it loses its own properties and qualities and puts on those of the new. The parable of the leaven may be taken to illustrate this process. The leaven is hid in the meal. But the mass of the meal, for some time afterwards, is apparently the same as before. The leaven is *hid* within it. It does not at once manifest it self to the observation of the senses. At a certain point, however, it exists; and there a process of fermentation begins, which continues, ever enlarging the sphere of its operation, until the whole lump is leavened. So in the act of regeneration a principle of new and spiritual life is lodged, or *hidden*, in the centre of human personality, which is destined to penetrate and leaven the whole lump of human nature, and to eradicate and destroy all that is corrupt and sinful therein. Thus the new must grow at the expense of the old, until the old has been wholly abolished and the new has become all in all. The Catechism calls this entire process conversion or repentance. We may, however, distinguish two stages within it, according as it is either spontaneous or voluntary. At first, and for a considerable time afterwards, the process is undoubtedly spontaneous, for we can not conceive of the new life as at any time wholly inactive. But it can not always remain spontaneous, for the reason that man is essentially a free creature and is not saved against his will. It must, therefore, at length be taken up into the consciousness of the mind and become a voluntary process. And now, up to and including, the point where the process becomes voluntary, we call it *conversion* ; from this point forward *sanctification.* The two determinations of the mind, namely penitence and conscious faith, reached in conversion, are however continued and become the principal subjective factors in the process of sanctification ; and in this respect conversion and sanctification are one and the same process. We, therefore, define conversion as the transition of the life of grace into the sphere of mind or consciousness, forming here penitence and conscious faith ; and sanctification as the transition of the life of grace, through penitence and faith, into the sphere of the affections, desires, inclinations and passions.

Conversion, as now defined, is not an instantaneous act of the mind, but a gradual process. To demand that every true Christian must know the place and the hour where and when he was converted, would therefore be like demanding of every grown man that he should know where and when he passed from a state of unconsciousness to consciousness. Every one who has attained to a state of consciousness is aware of the fact, though he cannot trace the steps or degrees through which he passed in attaining to this state. So every converted Christian will and must know that he is converted, though he may not be able to tell when and where this came to pass. Every one can know whether he is truly and sincerely penitent on account of sin, and whether he truly and sincerely renounces the world, the flesh, and the devil; and every one can know whether he truly and sincerely believes in "God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son," &c. And whoever is truly penitent and truly believing, is converted, whether he knows when and where he became so or not. There must be a time, of course, where the process becomes complete, and where then it passes over into the other process of sanctification, but if the process has been at all normal, no one will be able to tell that time. The flower opens gradually and slowly; no one can perceive the movement of the sepals and petals as they expand, and yet there must be a time when it may be said that the flower is now fully open. So it is with conversion in its normal process. If in any case it be sudden and abrupt, it is also abnormal. Thus it will always be, of course, where the process is hindered in its progress by adverse influences. If a man were born blind, and if then, when he is of full age, his eyes were opened by a surgical operation or by a miracle, the development of his sense of vision would, of course, be comparatively sudden, and he would be able to tell something about it. But that is not the normal way of the development of the perceptive faculties; nor is it the normal way of the development of faith. It will, however, always be the way more or less in the case of persons who, instead of being brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, are left to grow up in ignorance of the Gospel and in the service of sin, and who then lead a careless and ungodly life, until they are arrested by some special providence, or some miracle of grace, that causes them to "come to themselves," and to say with the prodigal that had squandered his substance, "I will arise and will go to my father, and will say, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight." Cases of this kind will, of course, always occur; but to make these the rule, and to suppose that it is necessary for all the children of the Church to have been prodigals before they can become saints, as Methodism virtually does, we think, would be like insisting that all men ought to be born blind and remain so until they are of full age in order that then they may have a lively sense of the joy of receiving sight. We regard this sentiment, which however prevails widely at the present time, as exceedingly pernicious in its effects upon the interests of Christianity and the Church. Who can tell how many children of the Church are lost in consequence of it? There are members of the Church enough everywhere, who, while pretending to superior piety themselves, make no effort to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, assuming that, although they may be baptized, they are still no better than heathen, and indeed can be no better until they are old enough to be converted and "get religion," which may all be brought to pass, if things go well, in the brief space of some winter's night. We regard this notion as one of the many delusions of Satan, by which the Church is afflicted at the present time, and against which we of the Reformed Church are bound, now as well as in the past, to bear our solemn testimony.

ART. IX.--THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

A GOOD deal has been said by those in the Reformed Church, who are opposed to its reigning theology, in regard to a lecture of Dr. Harbaugh, on "The Church Doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sin," published in the January number of this Review for the year 1868. It seems, that some of the statements contained in this lecture had found their way to some of these opponents of the theology taught in our Seminary, before it was published, and use was made of them to prejudice the minds of the people. It was said, that the Professors in our Seminary taught that no one can have an assurance of pardon, except through the absolution of the minister; that this was Romanism, &c., &c. In order to correct these misrepresentations, the lecture itself was published in this Review after Dr. Harbaugh's death. It was thought that its publication would silence these defamers. But such was not the effect. This continues to be the chief objection, urged by the party referred to, to the teachings of the Seminary. It is the only article, against which these attacks are made.

Now we desire to bring before the readers of the Review once more, what Dr. Harbaugh's lecture really did contain. Upon turning to that lecture, it will be found, that one main point in it is, that forgiveness of sin is to be obtained *in*, not *outside of*, the Church. "The sentiment is common—but as it is common, so is it false—that the forgiveness of sin is to be obtained outside of and separate from the Church, and without its intervention—and that this boon is to be enjoyed before the Church is entered. Where this idea is held, it is supposed, that the forgiveness of sin is a gift from the Holy Ghost direct, and without the medium of the Church. In that case the Creed ought to run: 'I believe in the Holy Ghost, the forgiveness of sin.' But it does not so run, &c."

Then come the Scripture passages in support of this general position, and then the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are held up as signs and seals of our pardon, according to the teaching of the Reformers, among whom Calvin and Ursinus are quoted. Now comes the language, to which so much objection is made, and which is paraded on all occasions, as an instance of the false teaching in our Seminary. Here it is:

"Without such an act" (as Baptism, to which the author refers in the preceding paragraph,)—"Without such an act, in which our pardon is certified to us, our hearts cannot possess a full and satisfying sense of forgiveness." This is the offending language in one paragraph. It is remarkable how well guarded it is. It does not say, that pardon is conveyed through the Sacraments, but that without them, we "cannot possess a full and satisfying sense of forgiveness." What Reformed teacher can say less?

"A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received Baptism as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission; and when, after baptism, he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed and sealed by Christ, by means of a divine act through the Church."

This passage, we believe, is chiefly referred to. The use of the word absolution in the latter clause of the sentence has evidently been understood as meaning the office called absolution in the Liturgy. It is clear, however, that the word is used with no such reference to this particular service. The connection will show this. Substitute the word pardon, and what for many is offensive will be removed. And this is just what is meant, for absolution is pardon; and one reason, perhaps, why this latter word was not used is because it occurs just before in the sentence.

Let us look further into this matter. The illustration brought forward in the succeeding portion of the paragraph is that of the Prodigal Son. The design of the passage is to show how a baptized child, who, like the Prodigal Son, has wandered away from God, and is brought to return in the way of penitence, is to receive the assurance of pardoned sin. We have a picture of this return. "Make room for him at My table, and let him eat of the body of My beloved Son, and tell him it was broken for him; give him of the cup, and tell him it is the New Testament in His blood, which was shed for him for the remission of sins. Say this to him as from Me. Thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven thee! Then there is joy in the house. Then there is joy among the angels. Then there is joy in the penitent's own heart."

Who cannot see the purport of all this? And who can find fault with it, but those, who themselves have fallen away from the Sacramental views of the Heidelberg Catechism? And just here is the trouble with the opposition to the teachings of our Seminary. Much of it is made up of elements that are not genuine Reformed. Such views as that of the *Mystical Union* of the believer with Christ is repudiated. From this standpoint then, they condemn the views of the Church.

In regard to this matter of the assurance of forgiveness of sin, there is much confusion in the thinking of many, and it is a good point, therefore, to use to shake the position especially of such as are weak. It is caricatured somewhat thus: "Behold these Romanizers! they teach that you cannot have assurance of sin unless some minister, as the Romish priest, speak an absolution over you. You cannot go into your closet and confess your sins to God, and receive assurance of pardon through His Spirit, but you must hear some minister's word before you can feel assured."

A great truth is here caricatured. No one questions, that every believer, every time he prays, no matter where, can have this assurance, and that it is spoken directly by the Holy Spirit in his heart. Though the believer stands related to Christ through, or in, the Church, yet his union is, at the same time, direct and immediate; for Christ is in the Church. But now, it must not be forgotten, the Holy Spirit does not reveal independently of Christ and His means of grace.

Suppose some person should say to these objectors: "I can have assurance of sin through the Holy Spirit without baptism;

therefore, there is no use of baptism." Would they not say: "The Holy Spirit will not confirm assurance to you, except through the means divinely ordained?" And yet this is just what is here contended for.

That comfort and assurance which the believer has, wherever and whenever he prays, rests, after all, not upon a direct revelation of the Spirit, apart from the means of grace. Our forgiveness is signed and sealed, according to the Heidelberg Catechism, in our baptism, and after baptism, we have pardon sealed to us also in the Lord's Supper, and by the word of Christ through His minister. He who denies this has departed from the Reformed faith. Let us hear no more in regard to this awful heresy of the forgiveness of sin. The misrepresentation is too clear to deceive any thinking person.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

EVOLUTION OF LIFE. By Henry C. Chapman, M. D., Member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

This work is published by the same house that published the work of Dr. Büchner, which we noticed in the last number of this Review. It is published in the same substantial, elegant style, and its theory is in close sympathy with that of Dr. Büchner. The author aims to simplify, popularize and enforce Darwinianism. The book contains chapters on Zoology, Botany, Geology, Embryology, Natural Selection, Anthropology. Apart from the horrid theory which it advocates, "that man has descended from an animal; that the remote progenitor of man was an ape, resembling the Gorilla and Chimpanzee, &c.," there is much in the work that is of real interest to the naturalist. It has a map, called a "Hypothetical Sketch of the Monophylitic Origin and of the Diffusion of the twelve varieties of Men from Lemuria over the earth," besides a large number of excellent illustrations.

SERMONS ON LIVING SUBJECTS. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872.

The subjects are: 1. Mary, the Mother of Jesus, Luke i. 28; 2. Loving God is but letting God love us, 1 John iv. 16; 3. Feet and Wings, Ezek. i. 24; 4. The Gospel of the Face, 2 Cor. iv. 6; 5. The Completing of the Soul, Col. ii. 10; 6. The Immediate Knowledge of God, 1 Cor. xv. 34; 7. Religious Nature and Religious Character, Acts xvii. 27; 8. The Property Right we are to get in Souls, 2 Cor. xii. 14; 9. The Dissolving of Doubts, Daniel v. 16; 10. Christ Regenerates even the Desires, Mark x. 35; 11. A Single Trial better than many, Heb. ix. 27; 12. Self-examination examined, Ps. xxvi. 2; 13. How to be a Christian in Trade, Matt. xxv. 16; 14. In and by things temporal are given things eternal, 2 Cor. iv. 18; 15. God organizing in the Church His Eternal Society, Heb. xii. 22–3; 16. Routine Observance indispensable, Matt. vi. 11; 17. Our Advantage in being finite, Heb. ii. 7; 18. The Outside Saints, Acts x. 34–5; 19. Free to Amusements, and too free to want them, 1 Cor. x. 27; 20. The Military Discipline, 2 Tim. ii. 3–4; 21. The Coronation of the Lamb, Rev. xxii. 1; 22. Our Relations to Christ in the Future Life, 1 Cor. xv. 28.

We have thought, that the most satisfactory notice of this book from Dr. Bushnell, who is so well-known to the readers of this Review, would be the giving of its contents. The reader can best judge from this, whether he desires the work or not. We need not add, that these sermons are written in Dr. Bushnell's usual vigorous and fresh style. He is an eminent and profound thinker, and ranks among the first theologians of this country.

FOUR PHASES OF MORALS. SOCRATES, ARISTOTLE, CHRISTIANITY, UTILITARIANISM. By John Stuart Blackie, F. R. S. E., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1872.

So far as we have examined this work, we have found it interesting and profitable. The sketches of the lives and teachings of Socrates and Aristotle are given in a fresh and masterly way. The author gives evidence of a good acquaintance with these philosophers and their systems. His treatment of Christianity is from the stand-point of Christian faith. Christianity is not merely a system of morals among others, but it is a religion which presents the only authoritative and absolute system of morality. Utilitarianism, as advocated from Locke to Mill and Bain in England, is handled with the severity it deserves. Altogether we can commend the healthy tone which pervades this work. As a popular presentation of the subjects discussed, it is successful.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, AS SET FORTH IN THE BOOK OF CONCORD, CRITICALLY EXAMINED, AND ITS FALLACY DEMONSTRATED. By Rev. J. B. Gross. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

It is not every man's calling to write on this subject. No subject has been so ably discussed by the most learned theologians in different ages. We do not see, that Mr. Gross gives us anything new. His argument, that, in the Aramaic, the language in which Christ is said to have spoken on the occasion of instituting the Supper, there is no verb to express "signifies," has been answered over and over again. The Greek is the only inspired language in the New Testament for us. We must abide by that, and the verb *is*, enters into the language of institution.

The author calls the Lord's Supper, "The mnemonic institution!" He says in a note, "The so-called sacramental consecration in the Christian Church is entirely abnormal and unwarranted, and is an idolatrous blessing of the elements instead of God." And yet St. Paul says, "The cup of blessing *which we bless, &c.*" Calvinism is as bad in the author's view as Lutheranism. "The Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper tends to schism no less than the dogma of the Real Presence; for its basis is as little scriptural, while its import is no less unintelligible." He thinks the doctrine of the real presence is the cause of the schism in the Protestant Church. Finally, the book winds up with a patriotic appeal for *our country*, and the patriotic hymn, "My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty." A singular ending of a treatise on the Lord's Supper.

THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By James Anthony Froude, M. A. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.

This first volume contains 637 pages, and is published in handsome style. Mr. Froude's merits and demerits as a historian are pretty well known. His history of Ireland in relation to England is designed to correct what he regards as a wrong sentiment on the subject, especially in this country. His history of Henry VIII did, we confess, somewhat change our estimate of that uxorious king; but we think Mr. Froude's portraiture is one sided. No one, however, will complain that Froude is sluggish or dull.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Charles Hodge, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vol. III. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. 1873.

This volume brings Dr. Hodge's great work to its conclusion. It treats of Soteriology and Eschatology. It must be confessed, that Dr. Hodge, in the production of this work, takes his place among the great theologians of the age. His system we regard as belonging to the past rather than to the present. His criticism of the latest and best theology of Germany, it seems to us, reveals an utter inability to comprehend either German philosophy or German theology. We believe Dr. Hodge has honestly done his best to represent Dr. Nevin fairly. That he has seriously misrepresented him is his misfortune, not a willful fault. Let us just refer to one example taken from page 20. Quoting from Dr. Nevin's Essay on the Moral Order of Sex, in the Mercersburg Review for 1850, where Dr. Nevin is speaking of the intimate relation between man and nature, the following language occurs: "The world, in its lower view, is not simply the outward theatre or stage on which man is to act his part as a candidate for heaven. In the midst of all its different forms of existence, it is pervaded throughout with the power of a single life, which comes ultimately to its full sense and force only in the human person." So far Dr. Nevin. Now let us see Dr. Hodge's comment. "The world, therefore, is pervaded by 'the power of a single life;' the highest form of that life (on earth) is man. What is that life? What is that pervading principle which reveals itself in such manifold forms of existence, and culminates in man? It is, of course, God." Then the author goes on to speak of the pantheism in all this. The pupils of Dr. Nevin would be surprised to find any one charging Pantheism on such language. But Dr. Hodge puts his meaning into it. He says the life of the world is God. Dr. Nevin does not say that, nor does he mean it.

On page 655, Dr. Hodge publishes a note, which we presume is designed to be a sort of explanation or apology for having appeared to misrepresent Dr. Nevin in his second volume. Dr. Hodge here disavows any intention to charge upon Dr. Nevin Hegelianism or a denial of Christ's proper divinity. The difficulty with Dr. Hodge all along has been, that he jumbles in one mass Hegel, Schleiermacher, Nevin, as though they stood in one school, and that a Pantheistic school. Now the truth is, that Dr. Nevin, in all his articles, has taken pains to disavow anything like a wholesale endorsement of Hegel in philosophy, or Schleiermacher in theology. But he does pay respect to their great thoughts. In the article on Liebner's Christology from which Dr. Hodge quotes, Dr. Nevin says: "It comes to nothing, that such deep and earnest thinkers are found to deviate here and there from the established orthodoxy of their time, that they are chargeable with great and serious errors, and that it is not safe to follow them blindly in their theological speculations. We know well enough, that it is not safe to follow any leader blindly, whether he be an original thinker or an easy traditionist who never thinks at all. That is not the question. We know, too, that Schleiermacher has fallen into serious errors, etc." Surely that does not sound like one, who could be regarded as standing in the school of either Hegel or Schleiermacher. We have found other minds besides Dr. Hodge, who never could understand the German modes of thought. The first principles are strange and new to one educated in the English or Scotch order of philosophic thought.

But we wish here to bear our testimony to the ability of Dr. Hodge's work in its own sphere. It is certainly one of the greatest theological works ever brought out in this country. It is written in a calm, clear and forcible style. It is a monument to the ability and untiring industry of one of the great theological instructors of this country. May the evening of life be calm and serene for the venerable author, and when his work on earth is ended, may he still live in the lives and labors of the large number whom he has aided in preparing for the holy ministry!

THE WONDERS OF THE MOON. From the French of Amedee Guillemin. By Miss M. G. Mead. Edited by Miss Maria Mitchell of Vassar College. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York. 1872.

ALSO THE WONDERS OF ELECTRICITY. From the French of J. Baile. Edited, with numerous additions, by Dr. J. W. Armstrong. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York. 1872.

The Messrs. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., are at present publishing an Illustrated Library of Wonders of Nature and Science, of which we have elegant copies before us. The title of the series might lead to the impression, that these works now in course of publication are to be mainly of a sensational character, and consequently fragmentary and deficient in thoroughness. Judging from the volumes before us, we are happy in saying, that such does not seem to be the case. So far as they are sensational, and we admit that they are sensational in a good sense, is owing to the particularly interesting subjects of which they treat, and the happy manner in which they are written and illustrated. They illustrate the old saying, that truth is stranger than fiction. Whilst they are prepared for the general reader, and those who have no time to peruse abstruse works, they are, at the same time, sufficiently exhaustive, without being tedious. The volume which treats of the Moon, describes everything that is important, interesting or reliable in regard to our satellite, in a clear, lucid and interesting style. It is an admirable monograph on that subject, to which all persons alike may refer with profit and pleasure. We can with truth apply the same remarks also to the work on Electricity. These works, we think, should find a place in our libraries generally, especially in the libraries of our colleges, of our district and high schools. They deserve also to be introduced into our families, where they might perform an important service, in supplanting many books, whose chief merits consist in being written for popular effect.

GANOT'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY FOR GENERAL READERS AND YOUNG PERSONS. Translated from the French and edited by E. Atkinson. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1872. pp. 522.

Ganot's Physics scarcely needs any further recommendation from the public press. It has already been introduced into a number of our colleges and high schools as a text book, and has received the commendation of our best teachers. It is a successful attempt at elucidating the phenomena of the different departments of Natural Philosophy, without having recourse to mathematical reasoning, which is not always appreciated by the general reader. It is fully up to the times, and gives in a clear and popular style the latest results of scientific inquiry. A large part of the book is taken up in considering the phenomena of light, heat and electricity, those mysterious agencies in nature, which, perhaps more than any others, are at the present time engaging the diligent study of scientific men. By numerous and admirable illustrations, these subjects are very much simplified in this book and made intelligible to ordinary readers. The book, however, is one that deserves careful study, and is well adapted to schools of all grades. As a text book in district and high schools, we consider it one of the best in the market.

ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY. By J. Norman Lockyer, Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, etc. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1871. pp. 312.

This is an excellent and interesting book. It comes from a living, active astronomer, of well established reputation both in this country and in England. It has, therefore, about it the air of freshness and originality, which we do not expect to see in a mere compilation. It is in various respects in advance of the text books that are now generally in use. Its most marked peculiarity consists in the fact, that the author commences his subject by introducing the reader at once to the consideration of the universe as a whole, and then bringing him down to the solar system and landing safely on *terra firma* at the end of his journey, instead of considering the earth first and then afterwards carrying him out and losing him in the regions of the nebulæ and fixed stars. Both methods have their advantages.

The author discards the old parallax of the sun, and adopts a new one, which changes the distances of the earth and planets from the sun considerably. It is generally conceded, that the old estimate made out in 1769, is slightly in error; but, as we understand, the error will not be correctly ascertained until the next transit of Venus over the sun, which is announced to take place in 1874, and for observations in regard to which, extensive preparations are already being made in both hemispheres.

We commend this book highly as embodying in a small space a large amount of reliable astronomical knowledge. It is adapted for schools of all grades, as well as for the general reader. We are informed, that it has been introduced as one of the text books in Astronomy in Franklin and Marshall College.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1873.

ART. I.—THE ROMAN QUESTION.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

WE present to our readers in the present number of the REVIEW, a somewhat full statement of the issue between the assumptions of the Papacy in the nineteenth century and the Old Catholics, together with an extended article on the subject, by Dr. John W. Nevin. It is scarcely necessary to state that in doing so our aim is to afford an opportunity to the readers of the REVIEW to become more fully acquainted with the question at issue, and to hold up its significance and importance before the American theological public, without committing ourself to any particular theory as to the result of the contest. How the result will finally shape itself must be left for history itself to determine.

The contest is not a new one in the Roman Catholic Church. It is only bringing forward an unsolved problem which has been struggling towards solution in that Church for ages. The question of the relation between the Pope and the Council occupied the attention of the Reforming Councils of Constance and Basel, even before the Reformation. The conclusion to which they came was different from that of the late Vatican

Council. The only ecumenical council held since the Reforming Councils of Constance and Basel was the Council of Trent. At that Council the issue was indeed raised, but it came to no decision. The Jesuits were then already the advocates of such primacy of the pope as would constitute the bishops simply his legates. Their cause was argued in a lengthy speech by their General, *Lainez*, with great vehemence. It is interesting to see how the question was handled in that Council by the head of the Jesuits. In his speech as reported by one who stood indeed in opposition to the court of Rome, but whose report in this case is no doubt substantially correct, he says:*

"That he (the Pope) is the only Pastor is plainly proved by the words of Christ, when He said He had other sheep which He will gather together, and so one sheep-fold should be made, and one Shepherd. The Shepherd meant in that place cannot be Christ, because He would not speak in the future, that there shall be one Shepherd, Himself then being a Shepherd, and therefore, it must be understood another Shepherd, which was to be constituted after Him, which can be no other but Peter and his successors. And here let it be noted that the precept, 'Feed the flock,' is found but twice in the Scriptures, once given by Christ to Peter only, 'Feed my sheep;' again by Peter to others, 'Feed the flock allotted to you.' And if the bishops had received any jurisdiction from Christ, it would be equal in all, and no difference between Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops; neither could the Pope meddle with that authority, to diminish or take it all away, as he cannot in the power of *order*, which is from God." In reply to the contrary arguments he said, "According to the order instituted by Christ, the Apostles were ordained Bishops, not by Christ, but by Saint Peter, receiving jurisdiction from him only; and many Catholic doctors do hold that this was observed: which opinion is very probable. But the others who say the Apostles were ordained by Christ do add that His Divine Majesty in so doing, did prevent (anticipate) the office of Peter, by doing for that one time what belongs to him, giving to the Apostles that power which they ought to receive from Peter, even as God took some of the spirit of Moses and divided it among the seventy judges. . . . . To those who inferred that, therefore, the Pope might refuse to make Bishops, and so himself remain the only man, he answered, it was God's ordination there should be many Bishops in the Church, to assist Him, and therefore He was bound to preserve them." To those who said the Council could not have authority if none of the Bishops had it (a poser we should say), he answered that "this was not inconvenient, but a very plain and necessary consequence, yea, if every particular Bishop in Council may err, it cannot be denied that they may err altogether." So the speech ran. On the other side it was urged by the Bishop of Paris "that instead of a celestial kingdom, this doctrine would make the Church, not a kingdom, but a temporal tyranny; that it taketh from the Church the title of Spouse of Christ, and maketh it a servant, prostituted to a man. He (Lainez) will have but one Bishop instituted by Christ, and the others not to have any authority but dependent from him, which is as much as to say, that there is but one Bishop and the others are his vicars, to be removed at his pleasure."

---

* History of the Council of Trent by *Polano,* translated by *Brent.* 2d edition, London. Printed by Bonham Norton & John Bill, Printers to the King's most Excellent Majesty, MDCXXIX.

The time was not come for such an enunciation ; the proposition of *Lainez* was withdrawn, and the more moderate *canon* substituted, "Si quis dixerit, in ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex episcopis, presbyteris et ministris: anathema sit."*

Thus the issue was suppressed until the recent Vatican Council, when the Decrees herewith published, enunciated to the world the final conclusion on the subject of the infallibility of the Pope.

Against these decrees, enunciating the infallibility of the Pope, the Old Catholics protest and maintain that in this the Church as represented by the Vatican Council, has departed from its own faith and teaching. They do so, as we understand, first, on historical grounds. The work which the Council undertook to decide was primarily of a historical character. Such is to some extent the work of every Council, but was especially such in the late Vatican Council. They came together to investigate what have always been the faith and teaching of the Church on this subject. The necessary conditions for such an investigation are that the necessary historical documents or material should be present, and that full freedom should be allowed in the Council to sift and consider it. For, even allowing that an ecumenical Council is guided infallibly by the Spirit into the truth, yet the Spirit cannot be supposed to provide the conditions of right knowledge in the case miraculously. The Holy Spirit did not do this even for the inspired writers of the New Testament Scripture. So far as they recorded historical facts, it is presupposed that they had access to these facts, as we know they had, without a miracle to supply them with the facts.

---

*Canones et Decreta Concili Tridentinii, Lipsiæ, 1866.

Now it is urged by the Old Catholics that the historical material at hand in the Council was not sufficient to establish the conclusion to which they arrived, and that some of the material on which they based their conclusion was spurious. This their best historians assert, as for instance Dr. Döllinger.* The insufficiency of history to establish the fact that the Church has always believed infallibility to reside in the Pope, and the contradiction involved by such a declaration was pointed out by "Janus" before and during the meeting of the Vatican Council.† The eminent scholars among the Old Catholics have not failed to point out the same thing since the meeting of that Council.

Besides it is maintained that the Council was not free during its meetings,—that it did not allow free discussion and the free expression of opinion by all its members. The current reports from Rome, and instances of coercion given and substantiated by individual members themselves, sufficiently establish this. Indeed the Jesuit position that the Council was not called to decide upon the truth, but only to confirm what the Pope had already decided for them, was maintained. From their standpoint it would seem that "the only business of Bishops at a Council must be to inform the Pope of the condition of their dioceses, to give him their advice, and form a picturesque background for the solemn promulgation of his decrees," and so far as the giving of advice was concerned, it must be an echo of the syllabus to be supported and maintained.

---

* Döllinger's Reply to the Archbishop of Munich.

† See "The Pope and the Council." By Janus. 1869.

The Old Catholics, moreover, take issue in regard to the consequences that must result from the enactment of the decree of papal infallibility. These, too, were foretold by "Janus." "If this desire is accomplished, a new principle of immeasurable importance, both retrospective and prospective, will be established—a principle which, when once irrevocably fixed, will extend its dominion over men's minds more and more, till it has coerced them into subjection to every Papal pronouncement in matters of religion, morals, politics and social science. For it will be idle to talk any more of the Pope's encroaching on a foreign domain; he, and he alone, as being infallible, will have the right of determining the limits of his teaching and action at his own good pleasure, and every such determination will bear the stamp of infallibility. When once the narrow adherence of many Catholic theologians to the ancient tradition and the Church of the first six centuries is happily broken through, and the pedantic horror of new dogmas completely got rid of, and the well-known canon of St. Vincent, '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*' which is still respected here and there, set aside—then every Pope, however ignorant of theology, will be free to make what use he likes of his power of dogmatic creativeness, and to erect his own thoughts into the common belief, binding on the whole Church."

The consequences, in regard to conscience, of the Vatican decrees are also pointed out. This point is brought out forcibly and eloquently in the address of Prof. Reinkens at the Cologne Congress, and published in the January number of this Review. Attempts to bind the conscience appear to have occurred before. Popes had issued bulls such as the one against the Jansenists, where it was enjoined that the faithful not only believe that the errors condemned are contrary to the true faith, but equally that they must believe that the errors condemned were contained in the work of Jansenius, thus rendering the Pope's judgment of the meaning of a book, as a matter of fact, binding on the conscience, as well as upon a matter of doctrine. But in the light of the Councils of Constance and Basel, and in the absence of any decree of the infallibility of the Pope, Catholics, while submitting to the order of the Pope, could still save their conscience. Now, however, the case is different. There can be no such reservation. Those who do not believe that the Pope is infallible, as heartily and truly as they believe in the divinity of Christ, for instance, are excommunicate here and eternally damned hereafter.

There are some who still try to save themselves as Father Hyacinthe explains it, or at least he tries to save them, by making a distinction between "true truth and official truth." * They give in their adhesion to the decree of Papal infallibility by a coercion of the will, by a silencing of conscience, or whatever it may be called. "The world should not be misled into believing that because almost every one of the Catholic bishops have *submitted* to the decrees of the Vatican Council, they believe in them (and we cannot attempt here to show how that 'submission' has been exacted), and much less that they accept the present condition and government of the Church as wise and sanitary. We believe that every intelligent bishop in the Roman communion deplores the present state of affairs as inextricable for the Church, dangerous for governments, and fatal to the individual faith. We know of those who groan in silence, being conscience-bound; others who writhe under continuous torture of the conflict between earthly responsibilities and their interior convictions. Others there are given over to despair; but, thank Heaven, there are some who hope, because they trust not in man, but in God." In proof of this state of mind and conscience in the Episcopate, he then gives extracts from letters from most worthy and eminent bishops in the Roman Church, which he obtained permission to publish.

---

* Letter of Father Hyacinthe in the *Independent*, April, 1873.

Again the old Catholics protest against the Vatican decree, that it interferes with loyalty on the part of subjects to the State. Here also we come upon an old and vexed question which never came to any final historical solution in the Catholic Church. The relation of Church and State must be determined in a historical way, consistently with the claims and prerogatives of the Church as well as those of the State, just as the relation of the supernatural and natural, in general, must determine itself historically. We may, indeed, say the one is above the other, the spiritual over the temporal, but this is not defining or settling their historical relation to each other. The State has an authority from God in its sphere; the family has authority in its sphere, and neither has the right to assume absolute control over the other. Our Saviour recognized the rights of both Church and State when he said, "Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." But the Church, while always maintaining the principles that where a clear case of conflict between divine and human authority occurs, we must obey God rather than man, yet has defined the relation of Church and State in different ways. It was the dream of *Hildebrand* to establish a universal theocracy, and from his time the Church began to encroach on the legitimate rights of the State. Examples need not be given where the Pope claimed the right, not only to put kings under the ban, but to absolve subjects from their allegiance (what our Saviour Himself did not do in regard to Cæsar), and authorize any power from other nations to come in and dispossess the king.* Now the figure of the two lights, the sun and the moon, was used to illustrate the relation of the two, and then again the figure of the two swords, as in the case of the Bull of Boniface VIII., called *Unam*

---

*Innocent III., in the case of King John of England, A. D. 1212.

Sanctam, to which Dr. Döllinger refers in his reply to the Archbishop of Munich. "Unam sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam et ipsam Apostolicam urgente fide credere cogimur et tenere. Igitur Ecclesiæ unius et unicæ unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum, Christus videlicet et Christi Vicarius Petrus, Petrique successor. In hac ejusque potestate duos esse gladios, spiritualem et temporalem, Evangelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus Apostolis 'Ecce gladii duo hic,' in Ecclesia scilicet: cum Apostoli loquerentur, non respondit Dominus, nimis esse, sed satis. Uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiæ, spiritualis, scil. gladius, et materialis," * etc. Must it be claimed that this interpretation of Scripture, of the instance of Peter's using the sword, is infallible? And that as a consequence the Church is authorized to hold and use two swords, a spiritual and a material one? This must follow from the decision on Papal infallibility. But Döllinger demurs. He will not be committed to the infallibility of Papal Bulls, for they may err.

This is an interesting question, and it is undergoing a new historical trial in the new conflict between Romanism, in this latest phase of its development, and some of the States of Europe. The Old Catholics are determined to maintain their loyalty to the king as well as to the Church. The new conditions under which the question is being tried particularly in Germany and Italy may lead to new revelations on this subject.

Some would have it that the only way out of this labyrinth is the adoption of the American theory. In this country Church and State are independent, it is usually said. Yet this must be qualified, for there are points on which they come together even here, as for instance in the case of the oath, of marriage, of keeping the Christian Sabbath, and in the matter of education. In reference to this last we are just coming to face some of the difficulties involved in the question of Church and State. These difficulties cannot be overcome by the State taking under its control the matter of religious education, for the State was never commissioned to teach Christianity,—nor by any attempt to deprive the State of all right to educate in any sense,—nor yet, as it would seem, by each doing its own work entirely separate. Perhaps we are in a better condition to meet these difficulties from the fact that we are not troubled by the complicated traditions of the past, as in the case of the States of Europe.

---

* Gieseler, translated from the third edition, Vol. II. p. 246, note 25.

But those European States have a problem of their own here, which has been upon them for centuries, and they must meet it from their own position. One thing we think history has settled, viz: that the Roman Church will never again rule over civil governments as she has done in the past. In the new adjustment of the relation between the two, which Europe is now struggling to make, it will be found, we think, that old things have passed away never to return.

These are some of the points which are considered with great ability in the following papers in this *Review.* The whole question, we may add, is none the less interesting because it lies within the domain of *Roman History*. There are those who take little interest in the question here brought forward, because it is something different from the dispute between Romanism and Protestantism, as this meets us in the Reformation. They say, this Old Catholic movement cannot work out any results because it does not start with the Protestant principle. It is not just a Protestant movement. But this betrays, it seems to us, a narrow spirit. The Roman Church has continued for three centuries since the Reformation, to be the larger portion, numerically, of Christendom. No one with a right historical sense and knowledge can look upon such a movement within that Church with indifference. The whole problem of Christianity is not confined to Protestantism. The question of Church union looks to something more than the mere uniting of a few Protestant denominations, (sometimes brought about in order to constitute a larger sect, and, as a result, to intensify the sectarian spirit), or, indeed, all of them. It is a matter of interest to look beyond this, and hope for a union which will bring Christendom together as a whole. We do not say this Old Catholic movement will effect this as a result, but it unquestionably brings this before our view. The manner in which Döllinger and his colleagues speak of Protestantism evinces a spirit of catholicity which we do not find in Ultramontane, or Papal-infallibility Romanism.

The movement is all the more important, in some respects, because it has this sense of an independent mission, because it is not a mere repetition of the Reformation of the 16th century. Gladly as we might hail a movement of the German Catholic Church towards Protestantism, yet such a movement would involve the solution of no new problem. It would strengthen Protestantism, but it would do nothing for Romanism as a whole, nor for the nearer approach of the two.

In this movement the Roman Church is confronted again, and under new circumstances (and, may we not say that Protestantism is in like manner challenged) with the question ot the relation of authority and freedom ? It is easy to see that there are difficulties on the Protestant side. This Review has not shrunk from holding them up to view. The evils of sectarianism and private judgment, where the principle of individual liberty is carried to excess, were pointed out in an earnest manner in its earlier numbers (as also in Dr. Schaff's Principle of Protestantism), when it was regarded as being untrue to the Protestant faith to do so. Times have changed during the last thirty years. The American Churches acknowledge the divided condition of Protestantism as an evil, and the tendency is setting in towards union. So, too, it is more generally acknowledged now that private judgment is not the only factor in the interpreting of the truth, and the living traditions of the Church in her creeds and confessions are respected far beyond what was the case a quarter of a century ago.

But from the beginning this *Review* has also presented the difficulties on the other side. If the consideration of those difficulties has not as frequently occupied its pages, it has been because it was more concerned to correct our own faults, in the public to whom it was addressed, than the faults of a communion to whom it was not directly addressed. But Mercersburg theology uttered a clear voice in reference to the wrongs which Romanism inflict on the freedom of reason and conscience and faith in the able discussion between Dr. Nevin and Dr. Brownson in 1850. These great thinkers stand in the same relative attitude to-day. Dr. Brownson, with what seems to us a giving up of some of his old freedom in criticising his own Church, and an advance in his surrender to the Roman principle, stands on the extreme position of Papal infallibility. Dr. Nevin, with unswerving devotion to the truth, in the face of misrepresentation from every side, stands as unswervingly for the truth he so nobly defended then. We commend to the attention of our readers his utterances on one of the great questions of the age.

ART. II.—FIRST DOGMATIC DECREE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST PUBLISHED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE HOLY ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN.

PASSED JULY 18, 1870.

PIVS EPISCOPVS SERVVS SERVORVM DEI SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.

Pastor aeternus et episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam aedificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes, unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre ; ita in Ecclesia sua Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem saeculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium

multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum caeteris Apostolis praeponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum, super cuius fortitudinem, aeternum exstrueretur templum, et Ecclesiae coelo inferenda sublimitas in huis fidei firmitate consurgeret.* Et quoniam portae inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam contra eius fundamentum divinitus positum maiori in dies odio undique insurgunt; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse indicamus, sacro approbante Concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate, ac natura sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo totius Ecclesiae vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam atque constantem universalis Ecclesiae fidem, proponere, atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos errores proscribere et condemnare.

CAPUT I.

DE APOSTOLICI PRIMATUS IN BEATO PETRO INSTITUTIONE.

Docemus itaque et declaramus, iuxta Evangelii testimonia primatum iurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesiam immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim Simonem, cui iam pridem dixerat: Tu vocaberis Cephas,† postquam ille suam edidit confessionem inquiens: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi, solemnibus hic verbis locutus est Dominus: Beatus es Simon Bar-Iona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi sed Pater meus, qui in coelis est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum: et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis. ‡ Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Iesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris iurisdictionem in totum suum ovile, dicens: Pasce agnos meos: Pasce oves meas. § Huic tam manifestae sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinae, ut ab Ecclesia catholica semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravae eorum sententiae, qui constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes negant, solum Petrum prae caeteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque iurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum: aut qui affirmant eumdem primatum non immediate, directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiae, et per hanc illi, ut ipsius Ecclesiae ministro, delatum fuisse.

---

* S. Leo M. serm. iv. (al. iii.) cap. 2, in diem Natalis sui.

† Joan. 1: 42.

‡ Matt. 16: 16—19.

§ Joan. 21: 15—17.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiae militantis visibile caput; vel eumdem honoris tantum, non autem verae propriaeque iurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

CAPUT II.

DE PERPETUITATE PRIMATUS BEATI PETRI IN ROMANIS PONTIFICIBUS.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Iesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesia instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesia, quae fundata super petram ad finem saeculorum usque firma stabit, iugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, imo saeculis omnibus notum est quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesus Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctae Romanae Sedis, ab ipso fundatae, eiusque consecratae sanguine, vivit et praesidet et iudicium exercet.* Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit.* Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, ut in ea Sede, e qua venerandae communionis iura in omnes dimanant, tamquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent. †

---

* Cnf. Ephesini Concilii Act. iii.

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione seu iure divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem; anathema sit.

CAPUT III.

DE VI ET RATIONE PRIMATUS ROMANI PONTIFICIS.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testimoniis et inhaerentes tum Praedecessorum Nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis, perspicuisque decretis, innovamus oecumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesia caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum Conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam dispo, nente Domino super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis iurisdictionis potestatem, quae vere episcopalis est, immediatam esse: erga quam cuiuscumque ritus et dignitatis, pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicae subordinationis veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae, per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; ita, ut custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam eiusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesia Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Haec est catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare salva fide atque salute nemo potest.

---

* S. Leo. M. Sem. iii. (al. ii.) cap. 3.

† S. Iren. Adv. Haer. 1, iii. c. 3. Ep. Conc. Aquilei a. 381, inter epp. S. Ambros. ep. xi.

Tantum autem abest, ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinarie ac immediatae illi episcopali iurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tamquam veri Pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni: Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesia. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*

Porro ex suprema illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam ius eidem esse consequitur, in huius sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totus Ecclesiae, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eamdem reddunt saeculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quae ab Apostolica Sede vel eius auctoritate ad regimen, Ecclesiae constituuntur, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis saecularis placito confirmentur.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatus iure Romanus Pon, tifex universae Ecclesiae praeest, docemus etiam et declaramuseum esse iudicem supremum fidelium,† et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse iudicium recurri; ‡ Sedis vero Apostolicae, cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam deeius licere iudicare iudicio. § Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberrant, qui affirmant, licere ab iudiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad oecumenicum Concilium tamquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifici superiorem appellare.

---

* Ep. ad. Eulog. Alexandrin. l. viii. cx. xxx.

† Pii P. VI. Breve Super Solidate, d. 28. Nov. 1786.

‡ Concil. Oecum. Lugdun. II.

§ Ep. Nicolai I. ad Michaelem Imperatorem.

Si quis itaque dixerit Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem iurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totem orbem diffusae pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremae potestatis; aut hanc eius potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; anathema sit.

CAPUT IV.

DE ROMANI PONTIFICIS INFALLIBILI MAGISTERIO.

Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex tamquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, haec Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiae usus comprobat, ipsaque oecumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, maiorum vestigiis inhaerentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: Prima salus est, rectae fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, haec, quae dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab huius ergo fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes, speramus ut in una communione, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse mereamur, in qua est integra et vera Christianae religionis soliditas.* Approbante vero Lugdunenis Concilio secundo, Graeci professi sunt: Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cuius Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut prae caeteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudicio definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definivit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

---

* Ex formula S. Hormisdae Papae, prout ab Hadriano II. Patribus Concilii Oecumenici VIII., Constantinopolitani IV., proposita et ab iisdem subscripta est.

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Praedecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terrae populos propagaretur, parique cura vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites, nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquae regulae formam sequentes, ea praesertim pericula, quae in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum.* Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis oecumenicis Conciliis aut explorata Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae sententia, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quae divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quae sacris Scripturis et apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea, Deo adiutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factam: Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

---

* Cf. S. Bern. Epist. 190.

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei numquam deficientis charisma Petro eiusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, coelestis doctrinae pabulo nutriretur, ut sublata schismatis occasione Ecclesia tota una conservaretur atque suo fundamento innixa firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero cum hac ipsa aetate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius actoritati obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, praerogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio coniungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christiane exordio perceptae fideliter inhaerendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam religionis Catholicae exaltationem et Christianorem populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esso voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic Nostrae definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, praesumpserit; anathema sit.

Datum Romae, in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octigentesimo septuagesmio, die decima octava Iulii.

Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quinto.

Ita est IOSEPHUS,

Episcopus S. Hippolyti Secretarius Concilii Vaticani.

ART. III.—DR. DÖLLINGER'S REPLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF MUNICH.

TRANSLATED BY PROF. J. S. STAHR, A. M.

YOUR Excellency has requested me in two letters to define my position with respect to the Roman resolutions of July 18th, 1870, which you have published.

The report comes from your Cathedral Chapter that you intend to proceed against me with such penal measures as are directed only against priests who are guilty of gross immoralities, and even against these only in rare cases. This is to come to pass if I do not, within a certain period, announce my submission to the two new articles of faith touching the absolute power and infallibility of the Pope.

At the same time I learn that another convocation and council of the German Bishops will soon be held at Fulda.

When in the year 1848 a meeting of all the German Bishops was held at Würzburg, I received the honor of an invitation, and took part in the proceedings. Your Excellency could perhaps arrange that at the meeting soon to be held, I may be allowed, not to take part in the proceedings, but to have a few hours' audience before the Bishops.

I make this request because I am prepared to prove before this meeting the following theses, which might prove of decisive importance in the present condition of the German Church, as well as for my personal position.

First: The new articles of faith are professedly based on the following Scripture texts: Matt. xvi. 18, John xxi. 17; and infallibility particularly on Luke xxii. 32, with which this dogma, so far as Scripture proof is concerned, stands or falls. But now we are bound by a solemn oath, which I have myself taken twice, "to accept and interpret the Holy Scriptures only according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." The Church Fathers all, without exception, explained the texts in question, in a sense entirely different from the new decrees, and found particularly in the text Luke xxii. 32, anything else rather than infallibility granted to all the Popes. I would accordingly commit perjury, if I were to accept the decrees with this explanation, and without it, they have no Biblical basis whatever. As I have said, I am prepared to prove this before the assembled Bishops.

Secondly: In several pastoral letters and proclamations recently published, the assertion has been made, and historical proof attempted, that the new doctrine promulgated in Rome of the absolute power of the Pope over every individual Christian, and of papal infallibility in doctrinal decisions, has been believed and taught in the Church from the beginning through the succeeding centuries down to the present time, with universal or almost universal consent. This assertion rests, as I am prepared to prove, upon an utter misconception of the tradition of the Church during the first thousand years, and a perversion of her history. It is in direct conflict with the plainest facts and testimonies.

Thirdly: I offer further to prove that the Bishops of the Romanic countries, Spain, Italy, South America and France, who constituted the immense majority in Rome, together with their clergy, were led astray by their text-books already from which they obtained their information during their seminary training, with respect to the subject of papal power, since the proofs given in these books are for the most part spurious, invented or distorted. I shall prove this as true first of the two principal works and favorite text-books of the modern Theological Schools and Seminaries, *The Modern Theology of S. Alphonso Liguori* (particularly of the included Tract on the Pope), and *The Theology of the Jesuit Perroni;* secondly of the writings of Archbishop Cardoni and Bishop Ghilardi, distributed at the time of the Council in Rome, and finally, of The Theology of the Viennese Theologian Schwetz.

Fourthly: I appeal to the fact, and offer to prove publicly, that two General Councils and several Popes decided as early as in the fifteenth century by solemn decrees published by the Councils and confirmed by the Popes, repeatedly, the question of the extent of the Pope's powers and of his infallibility, and that the decrees of July 18th, 1870, are in glaring contradiction to these resolutions, and therefore cannot possibly be binding.

Fifthly: I believe I am able to prove that the new decrees are utterly incompatible with the Constitutions of the European States, especially of Bavaria, and that in consequence of the oath to support this constitution which I have but lately taken again on my entrance into the Chamber of "Reichsräthe," I cannot possibly accept the new decrees, and their necessary consequence, the Bulls *Unam Sanctam* and *Cum ex apostolatus officio*, the Syllabus of Pius IX., and so many other papal declarations and laws which are now claimed to be infallible, and are in irreconcilable conflict with the laws of the country. I appeal on this subject to the opinion of the Legal Faculty in Munich, and promise at the same time to abide by the decision of any German Legal Faculty which your excellency may be pleased to name.

I make only two conditions for the conference which I have proposed, or rather for which I have asked; first, that my statements with the replies that may be made, be recorded, and permission granted to have them subsequently published. Secondly, that permission be given to a man of scientific culture, chosen by me for this purpose, to be present at the conference.

If this should be unattainable in Fulda and before the German Bishops, then I venture most respectfully to present a different request. May your Excellency please to form the members of your chapter into a Committee before which I may plead my cause in the way proposed above. Several of these venerable gentlemen are Doctors, and were previously Professors of Theology as well as my former scholars. I cherish the hope that it will be much more agreeable to them to engage in a calm discussion with me, to confute me if possible, with facts and arguments, than to sit upon the judgment-seat and frame spiritual sentences of condemnation against me, and to submit them to your Excellency for the purpose of fulmination, as it is called. If your Excellency will consent to preside at this Conference, and condescend to set me right with respect to any error that I may have committed in the citation and interpretation of proof and facts, I shall consider it a great honor, and the cause of truth can only gain thereby. And if you hold the exercise of your pastoral power in suspense over me, I still cherish the hope that you will prefer to exercise towards me in the first place the noblest, the most beautiful, the most beneficial attribute of this power—that which most resembles Christ—the teacher's office. I hereby promise publicly to retract everything that I have written on this subject and to confute myself, if I am convinced with facts and the testimony of good authorities. In any case the result must necessarily be advantageous to the Church, and the peace of souls. For it is not I alone who am personally concerned in this matter. Thousands among the clergy, hundreds of thousands among the laity, think as I do, and find it impossible to accept the new articles of faith. Up to this day, not a single one of those even who have declared their submission, has told me that he was really convinced of the truth of these articles. All my friends and acquaintances assert that they experience the same thing. "Not a single person believes in it" is what I hear every day from all sides. A conference like the one which I have proposed, and the publication of the proceedings, will therefore in my case afford that deeper insight for which so many long.

Your Excellency will perhaps refer me to the Pastoral Letter which recently appeared over your signature, as a source from which I can draw the necessary information and correction of my opinion; but I must confess that its effect upon me has been exactly the opposite, and I am prepared to prove that we have in it a long list of testimonies and proofs which are misunderstood, distorted, mutilated or invented, and which in connection with the suppression of important facts and counter-proofs present a picture utterly unlike the genuine tradition. No doubt the person to whom your Excellency entrusted this task, did not himself commit these forgeries, but borrowed them in good faith from others (from Cardoni and others); should he however be desirous of defending his work before the proposed conference, he will find me ready in a few hours to establish my assertion, or, failing in this, publicly to apologize. In view of the great importance of the matter, I feel constrained to make a single condition; viz: that the government be requested to appoint one of its officers conversant with historical and ecclesiastical affairs to attend the conference. As the matter is of the utmost importance to all governments it may be assumed that the State would not refuse this request.

Facts are not wanting in the past history of the Church to show that my proposition is in accordance with the principles as well as the practice of the Church. In the year 411, for example, a conference of two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and Donatist Bishops was held in three sessions under the presidency of an imperial officer Marcellinus, and the disputed doctrine of the Church was discussed, whereupon the latter decided in favor of the Catholic Bishops. In the year 1433 Bohemian Calixtines appeared at the council of Basle; a decree concerning the communion in one kind, which had been promulgated eighteen years before at the Synod of Constance, was now subjected to new discussion and examination, and the result was the famous compacts which, acknowledged by the Papal chair, formed a very important and significant concession to the Bohemians, deviating materially from the original decree. Resembling still more closely the method of procedure which I have proposed, is a conference widely celebrated in French history between the Bishop Du Perron of Evreux and the Protestant statesman and scholar Du Plessis Mornay, which was held in the year 1600 at Fontainebleau under the auspices of King Henry IV. The point at issue was to prove that Mornay in his book on the Eucharist had falsified or incorrectly quoted a considerable number of authorities. Henry presided in person, and the most eminent men of both churches were present as witnesses. After a few days, and after a number of Mornay's quotations had been examined, the conference was interrupted by the illness of the latter, but produced a remarkably favorable effect for the Catholic cause in the excited minds of that period.

Most reverend Archbishop! I leave it entirely to your discretion what form you will give to the conference which I desire and which must certainly prove welcome to multitudes of German Catholics, or what persons you will invite to attend the conference or oppose me. There is certainly no want of professional theologians in your Diocese who will be glad to accept your invitation. The practice of the Church proves, and Popes and theologians have acknowledged the fact that a doctrinal question is just as much a matter of concern to the laity as to the clergy, and that the former have a right to take part in the scientific examination and establishment of tradition. And here, where we have to do with a question of historical proof, I willingly subject myself to the judgment of the most eminent historians of the German nation and of the Catholic faith. Men like Ficker, Reumont, Höfler, Arneth, Kampschulte, Cornelius, Lorenz, Wegele and Aschbach shall judge whether my proof is critically and historically correct or not.

Your Excellency was formerly pleased to honor my book on the first or apostolic ages of the Church with your approval, and in Germany it is generally considered by Catholics a faithful representation of the founding of the Church; no answer worth mentioning has ever come from the Jesuitic Ultramontane party. But if the new decrees are true then I stand convicted of having entirely misrepresented the history of the apostles. The whole section of my book which treats of the constitution of the primitive Church, my representation of the relation in which Paul and the other apostles stood to Peter, is then fundamentally wrong, and I would be obliged to condemn my own book, and acknowledge that I have neither understood Luke's Acts of the Apostles nor the Apostolic Epistles.

The new Vatican doctrine invests the Pope with plenary power (*totam plenitudinem potestatis*) over the whole Church as well as over every individual layman, priest or bishop—a power which is to be considered at one and the same time as truly episcopal, as well as specifically papal, which is to comprehend everything touching upon faith, morals, duty and discipline, which shall lay hold of any one immediately, the monarch as well as the day-laborer, to punish, command or forbid, as the occasion may seem to require. The wording is carefully so arranged, that there remains for the bishops absolutely no other position and authority than that of papal commissaries and plenipotentiaries. In this way then, as every one acquainted with history and the Fathers will admit, the episcopacy of the Old Church is dissolved in its inmost essence, and an apostolical institution to which, according to the judgment of the Fathers, greatest significance and authority in the Church attaches, is dissipated into a shadow without a substance. For every one will see at a glance the absurdity of having two bishops in the same Diocese, one who is at the same time Pope, and the other simply a bishop; and a papal vicar or diocesan commissary is not a bishop, not a successor of the Apostles. He may be very powerful on account of the powers conferred by Rome, so long as his principal allows him to rule, just as a Jesuit or mendicant friar whom the Pope has endowed with abundant privileges is also very powerful, and I know very well that this prospect of an increase of power has been held out to the bishops in Rome, that they have often been told: "The more irresistible the Pope is, the stronger you shall be, for the plenitude of his power shall shed rich beams upon you." The bishops of the minority clearly discerned the delusion of these promises; as the "Analytical Synopsis" shows, they clearly recognized the fact that if the universal episcopate of the Pope should be established, they would indeed still be dignitaries of the Church, but by no means bishops in the true sense of the word. You yourself, most reverend Sir, had part in the deputations which made the most urgent remonstrances to the Pope on the 15th of July, remonstrances which Herr von Ketteler tried to make more emphatic by prostrating himself before the Pope. It is well known that these remonstrances were in vain. The only consolation offered to the Prelates who mourned the loss of their old ecclesiastical dignity, was confined to a declaration in the decree to the effect that the authority of a bishop is "ordinary" (i. e. a '*potestas ordinaria subdelegata*,' as the Roman canonists are accustomed to call it), and that the Pope considers it his duty to support this authority, in proof of which a mutilated passage from Gregory the Great was cited—a passage which, if quoted in full together with others of similar import, would really have proved to the world that this Pope of the seventh century rejected such a universal episcopate, in its present form, with the deepest horror, as a blasphemous usurpation.

In general there was no lack of prayers, representations and warnings before and during the Council. You yourself, most reverend sir, took part by attaching your signature to the same. The bishops of the minority on the 12th of January in an address to the Pope signed also by you, declared: "The declarations and acts of the Fathers of the Church, the *genuine* documents of history, and the Catholic system of doctrine itself present serious difficulties in opposition to the proclamation of the doctrine of Infallibility." At that time they were frightened, as they themselves say, at the prospect of discussing these difficulties, and prayed the Pope not to impose upon them the necessity of such a discussion, i. e. to relinquish the dogma of his infallibility. But when the Pope insisted that the Council should act upon this subject, the German Bishops on the 11th of March demanded exhaustive conferences on the question of infallibility which should be conducted by chosen deputations from both sides. These were not granted, and nothing more was allowed than speeches in the Aula, where all regular discussion was utterly impossible

I will here cite only one instance to show how indispensable, and urgently necessary such exhaustive conferences were. A considerable number of Italian Bishops in an address that has since been printed demanded that papal infallibility should be established as a dogma because two men who were both Italians and the pride of their nation, Thomas Aquinas and Alphonso Liguori, two brilliant lights of the Church, had so taught. Now it was well known, as I as well as Gratry had previously pointed out, that Thomas had been deceived by a long series of invented proofs, as indeed he supports his doctrine on this subject throughout only by references to such forgeries and not by genuine quotations from the Fathers or the Councils. And as far as Liguori is concerned, a single glance at his writings suffices to convince a practiced theologian that he dealt in forged passages still more largely than Thomas. My exposure of the fraud of which Thomas was a victim had created a great sensation in Rome. The author of a pamphlet written in Rome at that time and directed against me, says that a great cry was raised on the subject on every side. This should have made it absolutely necessary to examine into the matter. Such an examination if it had been made comprehensive and thorough would it is true have led very far; it would have resulted in establishing the fact that the theory of papal infallibility was introduced into the Church only by a long series of deliberate inventions and forgeries, and that it was afterwards spread and maintained by force, by the suppression of the old doctrine, and by the manifold means and artifices which are always at the disposal of the ruling power. Thus all efforts, representations, and prayers were in vain; no concessions were made even with the example of the Council of Florence, otherwise so often quoted, before their eyes, where the assertion of the Greeks that falsified passages of the Fathers were laid before them led to examinations and discussions that lasted for months and were conducted with the greatest care. Your Excellency certainly knows that whenever a true Œcumenical Council was about to adopt dogmatic resolutions, the ripest and most careful examination of tradition was considered an indispensable condition of their validity. And how great is the contrast in this respect between the mode of procedure at Trent, and that adopted in Rome in 1870! Most assuredly the treatise of Archbishop Cardoni, which had already been accepted by the Preparatory Committee, and was now to be regarded as proof by the assembled Bishops, could not have borne an examination even for an hour.

In the whole history of the Church, I know of only one General Council in which those in authority prevented, as they did in the late Council, all thorough discussion of tradition, and this was the Second of Ephesus held in 479; there in the so-called Robber Synod this was done by violence and tumultuous tyranny; in the Vatican Council, it was the method of procedure imposed upon the assembly, the papal committees and the will of the majority that suffered no regular or thorough examination to be made. Such an examination would undoubtedly have brought many serious and unpleasant matters to light; but it would also have preserved the Church from a state of confusion which even you consider lamentable. If now you nevertheless assert that the Vatican Council was entirely free, you must use the word " free " in a different sense from that which it ordinarily bears in theological circles. A Council is only then theologically free, when all exceptions and difficulties have been freely examined, and discussed, when all objections have been admitted and tested by the rules necessary for ascertaining the teachings of tradition. That not even the smallest beginning was made in this direction, that in fact the immense majority of Bishops from the Romanic countries lacked either the inclination or the ability to discern truth from falsehood, right from wrong, is proved by the pamphlets which appeared in Italy and were distributed in Rome, as for example those of the Dominican, Ghilardi, Bishop of Mondovi; and still further by the fact that hundreds of these Bishops could, without blushing, appeal to the unimpeachable authority of Alphonso Liguori.

It is well known that the Jesuits, when they determined to establish papal absolutism in Church and State, in doctrine and administration as a dogma, invented the so-called "*sacrificio dell' intelletto,*" and assured their adherents and disciples, and really convinced many, among others even bishops, that the most beautiful act of reverence to God, and the noblest Christian heroism consists in this: that man, renouncing his own spiritual light of self-acquired knowledge and understanding, should throw himself with blind faith into the arms of an unerring papal authority as the only sure source of religious knowledge. This Order has indeed succeeded to a great extent in exalting intellectual indolence in the eyes of multitudes to the dignity of a meritorious religious sacrifice, thus inducing men to waive historical examination, whose culture in other respects well qualified them to enter upon such a work. But the German Bishops, so far as we can judge in this respect from their pastoral letters, have after all not yet arrived at this stage of delusion. They grant certain rights and a sphere of activity also to science, to rational examination and investigation. They themselves appeal to history, as does also the pastoral letter which has appeared under your name.

In a pastoral letter of Bishop Lothar von Kübel in Freiburg, which I have just received, we read on page nine: "Does the Pope receive new revelations? Can he *create new articles of faith?* Certainly not. He can only declare that a given doctrine is contained in the Holy Scriptures and tradition, that it is therefore revealed by God, and must be believed by all." I do not doubt that your Excellency and all the other German Bishops fully assent to these words. If this be so, then we have to do, in the present confused state of the Church, with a purely historical question, and one which must be treated and decided upon only by the means which we have in our possession for this purpose, and according to the rules which apply to all historical research, the discovery of all past, that is historical, facts. There are in this case no special secret sources from which the Popes alone have the right or power to draw. The Pope and the Bishops must here necessarily place themselves, if we may use the expression, under the authority of the common law; that is, if their conclusions are to have any weight, they must apply that mode of procedure, undertake that examination of witnesses, with the necessary sifting and critical tests, which is alone able to give us truth and certainty, according to the common consent of men of all ages and nations who are capable of forming a judgment in historical matters. It was, therefore, and still is necessary to answer two questions in this way. First: Is it true that the three declarations of Christ concerning Peter have been understood in the whole Church, from the beginning through all the intervening centuries to the present time, in the sense which is now put into them, namely as granting infallibility and absolute universal power to all the Popes? Secondly: Is it true that the tradition of the Church in all ages proves the general acknowledgment of this double right of the Pope, in the writings of the Fathers, and the facts of history?

If these questions must be answered in the negative, it will not do to rely as Bishop von Kiibel and others do, on the assistance of the Holy Ghost, assured, as they say, to the Pope, and appeal to the obedience of faith due to him on this account: for the very question to be historically proved, is, whether such assistance is really vouchsafed to him. And where has this been done up to the present time? Not in the Council, for there, as Cardoni's principal treatise proves, even forgeries were resorted to, and an utterly false representation of tradition was made with a suppression of the most striking facts and testimonies on the other side. And this is the very point which I offer to prove.

And at this point I beg your Excellency to consider that the doctrine which we are now expected to adopt, is, in the nature of the case, according to the declaration of the Pope himself and the admission of all advocates of infallibility, *a*, or rather, *the fundamental article of faith;* that we have to do here directly with the *regula fidei*, the regulative norm which decides what is, and what is not to be believed. In future every Catholic Christian, if asked why he believes this or that, could only answer: "I believe or reject it, because the infallible Pope has commanded me to believe or reject it." This first principle of faith, as it must on this supposition have been revealed in the Holy Scriptures as clear as the sun, can never have become darkened in the Church; in all ages, and among all nations it must have governed the whole Church, and stood in the front rank of all instruction; and we still all wait to have it explained how the Church only after 1830 years hit upon the thought of making a dogma of a doctrine which the Pope in a letter addressed to your Excellency under date of Oct. 28th, calls *ipsum fundamentale principium catholicae fidei ac doctrinae.*

How was it at all possible that the Popes should for centuries indulge whole countries, whole schools of theology in denying this fundamental article? And where was then the unity of the Church, if there was a division in the very foundation of faith? And—may I add?—why was it that your Excellency yourself struggled so long and persistently against the proclamation of this dogma? Because it was not opportune, you say. But can it ever be 'inopportune' to give to believers the key to the whole temple of faith, to proclaim the fundamental article on which all the others depend? Here we stand in very truth giddy on the brink of an abyss which opened before us on the 18th of July.

If any one wishes to ascertain the far-reaching consequences of the late resolutions, let him faithfully compare together the third and fourth chapters of the Decree, and realize what a system of the most complete universal authority and spiritual dictatorship is here presented. Every Catholic is henceforth to recognize in his conduct and believe in plenary power over the entire Church as well as over every individual member, as it has been claimed by the Popes since Gregory VII. and expressed in the numerous Bulls since the Bull *Unam Sanctam.* This power is boundless, incalculable, it can make itself felt, as Innocent III. says, wherever there is sin, can punish any one, suffers no appeal, is arbitrary sovereignty; for, according to Bonifacius VIII. the Pope carries all rights in the shrine of his bosom. Since now he has become infallible, he can in one moment, with the little word "*orbi*" (*i. e.* addressing himself to the whole Church,) exalt any ordinance, doctrine, or demand into an infallible, indisputable article of faith. In opposition to him there can be no right, no personal or corporal freedom; or, as the canonists say: the tribunal of God and that of the Pope are one and the same. This system bears its Roman origin on its forehead, and it can never permeate the Germanic countries. *As a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine.* Not as a Christian; for it is incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel and the plain teachings of Christ and the Apostles; it aims to establish precisely that government over this world which Christ declined; it demands that authority over the congregations which Peter forbade to others and to himself. Not as a theologian; for the whole genuine tradition of the Church is in irreconcilable opposition to it. I cannot accept it as a historian; for as such I know that the persistent endeavor to actualize this theory of absolute authority over the world has cost Europe rivers of blood, confounded and degraded whole countries, broken down the beautiful organic constitution of the primitive Church, produced, and fostered and maintained the worst abuses in the Church. As a citizen, finally, I must reject it; because, by claiming submission to the papal power on the part of States, monarchs and the whole civil order, and an exceptional position for the clergy, it opens the way for endless, ruinous strife between Church and State, between clergy and laity. For I cannot conceal from myself the fact that this doctrine, the consequences of which were the destruction of the old German Empire, would, in case it should acquire the supremacy in the Catholic part of the German Nation, lay the seed of an incurable disease in the new Empire just established.*—Accept, &c.

I. VON DÖLLINGER.

Munich, March 28th, 1871.

---

* I have just read the following in the official organ of the Roman Curia and the Jesuits, the "Civilta" of March 18, 1871, p. 664: "The Pope is supreme judge of all civil laws. In him the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, flow together as in a point; for he is the Vicegerent of Christ who is not only the Eternal Priest but also King of kings and Lord of lords;" and immediately afterward: "The Pope is in virtue of his high dignity at the head of both powers."

ART IV—THE GERMAN BISHOPS AS WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH.

A Tract for the Time, composed from Authentic Documents, by a Catholic Priest, with the motto: *De ore tuo te judico.* Luke 19: 22.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY THE REV. E. W. REINECKE, NAZARETH, PA.

I.

THE *Pastoral Letter* which bears date September 6th, 1869, and is addressed by the *German Bishops assembled at Fulda to the members of their dioceses*, is subscribed by the Archbishops of Cologne and Munich, by the Bishops of Breslau, Würzburg, Fulda, Mentz, Hildesheim, Paderborn, Augsburg, Treves, Osnabrück, Eichstädt, Ermland, Culm and Speyer, the Apostolic Vicars of Saxony and Luxemburg, the Capitular-Vicar of the Archdiocese of Freiburg, and the Bishop elect of Rottenburg. In this pastoral letter occur the following passages:

"Fears are expressed that the Council might, and no doubt would, proclaim *new* articles of faith, which are not contained in the revelation of God or the traditions of the Church; and also establish principles, which might be detrimental to the interests of Christianity and the Church, incompatible with the just claims of the State, with civilization and science, as also with the proper liberty and the temporal welfare of the peoples. This is not all: even the Holy Father is charged with intending under the influence of a party, to make use of the Council as a means of *raising unduly the power of the apostolic see*, of changing the old and genuine constitution of the Church, and of establishing a spiritual despotism incompatible with Christian liberty. . . . The suspicion is accordingly openly expressed, that an *untrammelled liberty of discussion* would not be granted to the German bishops, and that these bishops themselves would be wanting in the erudition and courage indispensable to a proper discharge of their duties as members of the Council; and, as a consequence of all this, even the validity of the Council and its conclusions are called in question."

"A General Council never will and never can proclaim a *new* doctrine, such as *is not contained in the Holy Scriptures or the apostolic traditions;* as it is the practice of the Church, always indeed, when she gives an expression in matters of faith, not to proclaim new doctrines, but to set in a clearer light the old and original truth, and to defend it against new error."

"Rest assured, therefore, that the Council will not establish any new principles, nor any principles whatever, except those which *by faith and conscience have been written in all your hearts*, and which the Christian nations through all centuries have regarded as sacred."

"Nor need any one fear that the Council will, without due consideration and with undue haste, arrive at conclusions, which, without any necessity thereto compelling, stand in antagonism with existing circumstances and the requirements of the present age; or that in the manner of fanatical men it will transplant into the present, views, customs and regulations of the past."

"In a Council of the Church it is not the custom for different *parties* to struggle with all the arts of persuasion for mere victory; nor do individual members of it seek, *merely by securing a majority*, to gain ascendancy over opponents. . . Especially where the everlasting verities of faith are concerned, the Council will not determine even *the most trifling point*, without having previously exhausted all the resources of *science*, and of the *most mature consideration*."

"Nothing is so foreign and so opposed to the very essence of the Catholic Church, as party spirit. . . As Peter and the Apostles at the first Council at Jerusalem, were of *one* mind and all spoke *the same* language, so it will also be at this time; and it will become manifest to the whole world, that, as in the first Christian congregation, so in the Catholic Church now also, all are of *one* heart and of *one* soul."

II.

In a pastoral letter, dated November 12th, 1869, Bishop Ketteler, of Mentz, says:

"Whether the next Council will establish any doctrinal decisions, and what may be their nature; whether, for instance the infallibility of the pope in matters of faith, and the extent of it, will be discussed, of this we are not informed. . . But one thing we do know with full certainty, that if these or similar doctrinal points should be acted upon, the approaching Council will, like all its predecessors, follow those *unalterable* and wise rules, which come from the Spirit who guides the Councils. . . The first rule for *all* decisions in matters of faith is, that the Church in her General Councils decides only such questions of faith as the circumstances of the age *necessitate* her to decide; the second is, that even in these decisions the Church must limit herself to that which is *necessary;* . . . The third, that such decisions are formed *not merely according to majorities*, but *according to the unanimity of the teachers of the Church as a whole*."

"Such, no doubt, will also be the rules which shall guide the approaching Council; and if the Council shall give any decisions on points of faith, you may rest assured they will have been compelled to do so by the circumstances of the times, in order to maintain pure the doctrine of Jesus; and that such decisions will *have been reached either with an absolute unanimity of the assembled bishops*, or, *at least*, *with such a majority as will be the same as unanimity;* and that, above all, in these decisions the head and the members of the body of apostolical teachers, the pope and the bishops, will agree with indissoluble unity and in the most perfect manner."

III.

The Bishop of Paderborn, in his "Text-book of the Catholic Religion," (Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion), which was first published in 1844, and has been used under the sanction of the bishops in most of the German gymnasia, says:

"Among the apostles each was endowed individually with infallibility in doctrine, since the work to which each of them was called required such an endowment. But the object for which Christ has bestowed infallibility upon the Church does not require that every individual successor of the apostles, every bishop, should be infallible in doctrine; for this purpose can be *fully* reached on this condition, that infallibility belongs to the successors of the apostles *as a whole.* Christ, therefore, with a view to the more perfect union of each to all, has so ordered, that *only the whole* can lay claim to this gift."

"Hence the successors of the apostles collectively taken, that is, the whole of the bishops in their subordination to the successor of St. Peter, the pope of Rome, form the Church in its capacity of infallible teacher."

"The way and manner in which the Church teaches infallibly, is various. Either the bishops, called together by the supreme head of the Church, assemble at an appointed place according to the precedent of the apostles (vid. Acts 15); where, after previous common consultation connected with religious solemnities, and under the presidency of the head or his vicar, they give decisive utterances on points of faith or morals; or the supreme head of the Church, in his capacity of guardian of the faith, gives alone such an utterance, *which subsequently obtains the expressed or silent consent of the remaining bishops* (ecclesia dispersa). In both cases the utterances given, or the conclusions arrived at, are infallible, *since they proceed from the whole teaching Church.*"

As late as the 13th edition, published in 1869, we read in § 191, as follows:

"Among the apostles each possessed individually the gift of infallibility, since the work, which each had to perform individually, required infallibility in doctrine. In post-apostolic times, however, only the *integral whole* of the true successors of the apostles, that is, the integral whole of the bishops in subordination to the pope, possesses this gift. *In this manner the expressions of the Holy Scriptures pertaining to the matter have been understood by the Church from the beginning,* and by means of this arrangement the union and communion of the

Church are strengthened as by another tie. The *bishops, collectively taken*, united and subordinate to the Roman pope, are therefore also called distinctively the teaching Church."

In the pastoral letter, published by the same bishop, *Martin* of *Paderborn*, during Lent, A. D. 1862, we read:

"The Church of Jesus Christ, *governed by Peter and the other apostles and their true successors*, is incapable of error and infallible in matters of religion. As regards the mere *power*, Christ could no doubt have imparted the gift of infallibility to every individual, instead of to His teaching Church *as a whole.* But such was *not His will, in order that the individual might not exalt himself.* . . For such and other reasons, therefore, Christ willed to impart the gift of infallibility not to each individual separately, but *only to his teaching Church as a whole.*"

The Prince-bishop, *Forster* of *Breslau*, says in his sermons, published in 1843; (II. 50):

"The teaching office bestowed by Christ upon His apostles is not infallible in its separate members, but infallible when it pronounces a decision *as a whole.* The promise was not given to the individual, for the individual does not constitute the Church, but only where her representatives are assembled in His name. Not to this or that elect one only does the Holy Ghost open the understanding of the divine word; He remains as the universal and infallible teacher and comforter with His *Church* forever, and guides her into all truth, that so she may be the bearer of this divine truth for all ages and nations."

IV.

During the Council repeated complaints were made by many bishops concerning the order of business, which was established in an unfair way by the pope. A paper with reference to this matter, dated March 1st, 1870, and signed by more than one hundred prelates of different nations, was handed in to the presidents of the Council (printed in Friedrich's *Documenta*, I. 262.) Here we read:

"Let us be strictly governed by the traditional rule observed by all the Œcumenical Councils, not to define points of faith by numerical majorities, but by *moral unanimity.* Pius IV. laid so much stress upon this at the Council of Trent, that in the case of an important point of doctrine, "he would have no definition established, unless it were unanimously adopted by the fathers." And this custom, in fact, is in full harmony with the noted saying of Vincentius Lerinensis: "What has been believed always, everywhere, and by all." And since catholic doctrine, as Bellarmine says, rests upon the *consent of the churches*, it follows, that the definition of doctrines by the councils requires a moral, unanimous consent of the fathers, who represent the Church. In the case of the Vatican Council it seems the more necessary to insist upon this rule, since so many fathers have been admitted to the privilege of voting, concerning whom it is by no means clear, whether the privilege belongs to them by divine right at all, and not simply by ecclesiastical right. . . ."

"As regards the number of votes necessary to the decision of a doctrinal question, we consider this as a point of such importance, that, if what we reverently and urgently ask for is not granted, *our conscience will be weighed down with an intolerable burden.* We would fear that the œcumenical character of the council might be questioned, that an opportunity might be given to opponents for attacks upon the holy see and the council, and that thus the authority of the council might be weakened among Christians, as if it had been neither true nor free; which would in these unsettled times be so great a calamity, that we can think of none worse."

V.

On the 10th of April, a paper drawn up by Cardinal *Rauscher*, and signed by a number of bishops, was handed in (printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, II. 388,) in which we read:

"Since the popes of the Middle Ages, as was done at the time by even the most learned men, judged past times according to the norm of their own age, and were also misled by false reports concerning popes of former centuries, which were said to have deposed emperors, they as a consequence firmly believed, and expressed their belief in decrees and rescripts, that God had invested them with the right of *commanding and judging in all secular affairs with reference to what was sin;* for that Christ, the Lord, had given to St. Peter and his successors two swords; the one spiritual, which they bore themselves; the other secular, which princes and soldiers had to bear *according to their direction. This doctrine* concerning the relation of the papal power to the secular was proclaimed by *Boniface* VIII., in the bull *Unam Sanctam*, and thus *held up to all believers for their acceptance.* There are some who, for the sake of removing the difficulty, assert that Boniface defined nothing more than, 'that all men were bound to acknowledge the Roman pope as head of the Church appointed by Christ.' But whoever knows what had taken place between Boniface and Philip the Fair, cannot be in doubt as regards the meaning of the pope, who published the bull at a synod called together with direct reference to the affairs of France. Regard for truth does not allow us to set aside what is evident, nor is it prudent; for he that makes use of such weapons, gives to the enemies of the Church the best pretext to defame her, and to reject even those testimonies of history, which are favorable to her. Besides, down *to the seventeenth century the popes taught openly that the power over secular affairs had been conferred upon them by God*, and they condemned the contrary opinion.

"*A different doctrine* concerning the relation of the spiritual to the secular power *is proclaimed by us*, and by nearly all the bishops of the catholic world, *to the Christian nations.* We teach namely, that the dignity of the two powers is indeed different; for just as heaven is higher than the earth, so also are the everlasting treasures, which are communicated to men by means of the spiritual power, higher than the temporal, to the preservation and increase of which the direct activity of the civil power confines itself; but that each of these two powers is, in the sphere entrusted to it, next to God, supreme, and not subject to the other in its special work; that the secular prince, as member of the Church, is subject to the authority of the Church, to which by divine appointment the power is given to inflict ecclesiastical penalties even upon emperors and kings, but by no means the power to depose them, and to absolve their subjects from their allegiance; that the power of judging kings and kingdoms, which the popes of the Middle Ages exercised, had accrued to them in consequence of a peculiar condition of national law; but that the foundation upon which it rested having been taken away by a thorough reconstruction of public institutions and private relations, it had itself also passed away.

"That which we teach concerning the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority, is not new, but very old, and supported by the unanimous consent of the holy fathers, and by the utterances and precedents of all the popes to the time of Gregory VII. We do not therefore doubt that it is perfectly true; for God forbid, that on account of the distress of the times we should corrupt the true sense of the divine law. But it is necessary to point out the dangers that would threaten the Church from a decree, which should not agree with our teaching. No one is ignorant of the fact, that it is impossible to reconstruct civil society according to the norm established in the bull *Unam Sanctam.* But a change of human views (and institutions) can set aside neither a power conferred by God, nor the obligations involved in it. If the Roman pope, as successor of St. Peter, had really obtained the power represented by the two swords, and, so possessed by divine right, as is asserted in the bull *Cum ex Apostolatus officio*, plenipotentiary power over people and kingdoms, the Church would have no right to conceal this from believers; for she must walk in the footsteps of St. Paul, who tells those whom he had undertaken to teach: 'I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.' But if Christian instruction should be arranged in accordance with this, it would profit the Catholics but little to give the vague assurance: What regards the power of the holy see in temporal affairs, passes not beyond the boundaries of theory, and has now no significance whatever in reference to existing relations and events; Pius IX. has not the remotest intention of deposing secular rulers. For the opponents would scornfully answer: ‘We do not fear papal decisions; but after many and manifold prevarications it has now at last become manifest, that every Catholic, who acts according to the faith which he confesses, is a born enemy of the State, since he feels himself bound in conscience to do all he can to bring all kingdoms and nations into subjection to the Roman pope.’ It is superfluous to point out the manifold calumnies and machinations, for which this would furnish occasion to the enemies of the Church.

“In these circumstances it cannot be a matter of doubt to him, who carefully looks at this difficulty, that it ought to be most carefully discussed, before we come to act on the infallibility of the pope. The deliberations asked for by us as early as the 11th of March, might contribute much towards clearing it up; but the question, whether Christ had conferred upon St. Peter and his successors power over kings and kingdoms, is especially in our times of such importance, that it requires to be laid before the Council in a direct manner, and to be carefully weighed and examined by it from all sides. It were not right to induce the fathers, without accurate and full knowledge of the matter, to decide a point, the consequences of which are so extensive, and come in such manifold and close contact with the relations of the Church to human society. This question, therefore, should be submitted to them for consideration, before the eleventh chapter of the *schema* concerning the Church—which refers to the infallibility of the pope—is taken in hand. If it is preferred, the question can be brought forward by itself; but inasmuch as it cannot be thoroughly considered, unless the relation of the ecclesiastical to the civil power is investigated from all sides, it seems to us best calculated for the purposes of truth, to act upon chapters 13 and 14, before taking up chapter 11th.”

VI.

The request mentioned in No. 5, was not regarded; on the contrary it was decreed about the end of April, that, setting aside all other subjects of consideration, including even those already partly acted upon, the papal infallibility should at once be made the order of the day. Against this 67 bishops protested in a paper to the president of the Council, dated May 8th, 1870. This paper (printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, II. 392,) was signed among others by the Archbishops of Prague, Olmütz, Munich, Bamberg and Cologne, by the Bishops of Breslau, Mentz, Augsburg, Osnabrück, Ermland, Rottenburg, the Apostolical Vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian Field-Provost. We here read:

"To act upon the primacy of the pope by itself, (not in connection with the general divisions of the *Schema* referring to the *Church*), is contrary to logical order. In the second public session we have sworn, that that sense of the Holy Scriptures is to be regarded as the true one, which has been always and is still understood as such by the *Church;* and in the third session we have prescribed the same truth as the rule of faith to all believers, that it belongs to the Church to judge concerning the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. This is the infallibility of the Church of Christ. But since the Church and the pope are not identical, and infallibility is claimed for both, the infallibility of the pope evidently cannot be acted upon, if the doctrine concerning the highest teaching office of the Church, and concerning the relation of the teaching office of the pope to the infallible teaching office of the Church of Christ has not been previously settled. This is demanded by our oath and by the norm of faith proclaimed by us; if we do not do this, we will be justly accused of having violated the laws of logic, and of having contradicted ourselves.

"Every discussion, moreover, must start with that which is certain and beyond a doubt, and controverted by no one. But the infallibility of the Church of Christ is a matter of certainty, and in the minds of all Catholics beyond all doubt, which can by no means be asserted of the personal infallibility of the pope. Hence we must first act upon the Church and her infallible teaching office, and afterwards on the power to teach which belongs to the pope in the Church of God. Separate action on the doctrine of the primacy is incompatible with the welfare of the Church, which, above all, we must keep in view. . . It is very much to be feared, that a decree concerning the prerogatives of the pope, proclaimed apart from the doctrine concerning the Church of Christ, might fill men's minds with new prejudices, and be calculated rather to repel than to conciliate.

"The order of proceeding proposed to us is in our view incompatible also with the dignity and welfare of the holy see. Love and veneration of the pope, the successor of St. Peter, constrains us to object with all our power against such a proceeding. We know very well, indeed, that this confession of our most unfeigned devotion to the holy see, will, perhaps, on account of *the agitations which just now have blinded the minds of so many in Rome and in the Church*, be aspersed with suspicion; and we must therefore rest content with the witness which our conscience gives us, that nothing else than an honest zeal for the honor and welfare of the holy see constrains us to think to speak and to act as we do. We shall, therefore, with the, openness which belongs to true and unfeigned love, state the reasons of our conviction.

"When at first, in a paper published at Rome, the declaration of papal infallibility was demanded, all the enemies of the Church cried out,—and this godless cry spread more and more over the whole world;—that the pope, in assembling the bishops at Rome, had used the common weal merely as a pretext; *that his real design was the increase of his own power;* that the reasons urged in the Bull of June 29th, 1868, for calling the council together . . . were only pretended ones. We have . . . not ceased to protest against these calumnies. But if *after all that which has occurred in the meantime*, if after *so many epistles and public speeches, in which the holy father has himself recommended the definition of the papal infallibility,* nothing else is accomplished by the bishops convened in Council than a short doctrinal decree, viz: the four chapters concerning the Christian faith, which were published in the third session, and a decree still shorter and *even less demanded by the circumstances of the times in which we live*, the decree concerning the primacy and the infallibility of the pope; and if these two decrees *should be the only result of our deliberations extending over six or seven months, after reaching which we were to return home*, to renew the stubborn contest against the spirit of falsehood in those places to which God has sent us to guide His Church, uncertain whether or not the council would at a later date be continued and the whole doctrine of the Church be defined in the following year; then indeed the calumnies referred to would acquire such force, and *by all that has happened at Rome such corroboration*, that we cannot without the deepest pain think of the degree to which *love and veneration for the holy see*, *and even faith itself and the salvation of souls may be shaken.* We content ourselves here with merely expressing this conviction, without adding any request; for we can no longer reconcile it with *our episcopal dignity*, with the office which we bear in the Council, and *with the rights which are due unto us as members of the Council*, to prefer requests; since *experience has sufficiently, and more than sufficiently taught us, that such requests are not only not entertained, but not even honored with an answer.* Nothing, therefore, remains to us, but to *cry out and protest against* the proceedings referred to, which in our view are *in the highest degree pernicious to the Church and the holy apostolic see;* that we may thus before men and the fearful judgment of God free ourselves of responsibility for *the unhappy results which will undoubtedly shortly take place*, *and are even now already taking place. Of this the present writing is intended to be an everlasting testimony.*

"If the intended decree concerning the Church, *excluding all questions which might stir up controversies*, should be framed especially to portray before the eyes of all the beauty and majesty of the bride of Christ, to the greater honor of God and the salvation of souls, how easy it would then be for us in a short time to finish the whole doctrine of the Church, and perhaps even to celebrate together the approaching Pentecost, on which yearly the memory of the founding of the Church is renewed, with general and exceeding joy! Then a glorious Pentecost would dawn upon the Vatican Synod, the brightness of which would enlighten the whole earth and fill all Christians with joy. But, alas, this joy is scarcely to be hoped for; on the contrary we have reason to fear, that this Pentecost will be for us *a day of sorrow, rather than a day of joy.* This they will have to answer for, who, neglecting to provide through the Council for the urgent needs of Christendom, vanquish not the enemies of the Church but their own brethren and gain the palm of victory for mere scholastic opinions, which will inflict a severe injury upon the Church; an occasion now, and still much more in prospect of the future, for abiding concern and fear.

"May it please God to ward off such calamity from the Vatican Council, and by His heavenly grace to restore us all to harmony."

VII.

Individually, also, did the German bishops express themselves concerning papal infallibility, in the written remarks on the prescribed *schema* (plan), which they handed in to the special commission of the Council. The report of the commission on these remarks is printed in *Friedrich's Documenta* II. 202, etc. We select from it (No. 7-13) the following extracts.

Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, remarks:

"As regards the definition concerning the infallibility of the pope, I am certainly altogether *inclined* to believe, that God will not suffer His representative on earth, who is invested with the highest office and the highest power to teach and to guide the Church, to depart from the way of truth, as often as in the practice of his office he instructs the whole Church in matters of faith and morals. I will also very cheerfully accept and admit, that to such decrees and decisions of the pope all believers owe a true and sincere obedience. But to the proposed definition concerning the infallibility of the pope I *cannot* for various reasons, give my assent.

"In the first place I am not convinced that the same is *necessary.* For the authority of the holy apostolical see in reference to teaching and deciding in matters of faith and morals was never greater than just now. *But to establish without necessity new doctrinal definitions, has never down to this* *time been customary in the Catholic Church, and is also not advisable.*

"Moreover, the infallibility of the pope is still a matter of controversy among theologians, and *many learned and orthodox men regard this definition as an impossibility;* on the one side because of the many weighty objections which can be urged against it on the ground of various historical facts and of manifold utterances of the holy fathers, which prove that a *unanimous and general assent with reference to this point never existed in the Church;* on the other side, on account of the difficulty of so framing the definition, that room would not be left for very many doubts and controversies concerning the interpretation and application of the same to particular cases both in the past and in the future.

"Many, again, even of those who are inclined to give their assent to the view of the infallibility of the pope, *do not possess such a sure and firm conviction*, as is needed, in order, without heavy guilt, to prescribe and impose this view upon the faith of believers on penalty of everlasting damnation. It is therefore *not at all to be expected*, that this definition can be adopted with *unanimity*, and it is not to be doubted that a large number of bishops will oppose the definition. *Down to this time, however, it has never been customary in the Church of God, nor held to be right, to accept new doctrinal definitions without at least the moral unanimous assent of all the bishops present at the Council.* Therefore I urgently beg that the discussion of this matter may be held in total abeyance during this Council, that by means of this discussion the greatest diversity of opinion among the fathers may not become manifest, and the authority of the Vatican be thus seriously impaired.

"I further hold a definition concerning the infallibility of the pope at the present time to be highly inopportune for the following reasons:

"To many believers, especially in countries of mixed confessions both in the East and the West, in which this view has not heretofore been acknowledged, aye, not even known, such a doctrinal definition would furnish occasion for the strongest temptation to schism and apostacy from the faith, since they would discover therein a change of religion, in fact a change in the very foundation of it.

"2. Many believers in Christ, who yet stand separate from the Church but desire to return to it, would by this become so perplexed, and so estranged from the Church, that they would be further off from her than ever before.

"3. In the minds of many believers this definition would not increase the love and devotion to the holy see, by which they are now animated, but it would rather diminish and weaken them.

"These are the reasons why I pray and desire, that the discussion and definition of the infallibility of the pope may be held utterly in abeyance. Or, if this is not regarded with favor let a number of men of high erudition be chosen from both the friends and opponents of this definition, charged with the dnty of minutely and thoroughly investigating and clearing up on both sides the question under discussion, and of gathering all arguments and documents having reference to it, that so the truth may become evident to all; and then let this same question be brought forward a newat the next Council, or at a later date at the present one, if it should continue so long.

"But since some very recent unjust and intemperate attacks of certain professors and newspapers upon the authority of the holy see seem to require some check and counteraction, I could wish that a supplement or canon might be added to chapter II. setting forth: That the pope possesses the highest authority to teach and judge in matters of faith and morals, and that all believers owe a true and unfeigned obedience to his decrees and judgments."

VIII.

Bishop Krementz of Ermland, declares:

"1. The definition contained in the *schema* seems in no wise to be necessary; for the rights of the apostolical see are not in our day called in question by Catholics; on the contrary there has never perhaps been a time, when the children of the Church have so cheerfully obeyed the pope as at present.

"2. There are not wanting men who are strongly attached to the Catholic Church, who from doctrinal and historical grounds regard such a definition as impossible. In fact very weighty difficulties are still in the way. Who does not know, to refer merely to what is universally known, that the controversy concerning the Honorius question is by no means at present in such a posture that the doctrine in question can be proclaimed as revealed of God?

"3. It is not clear how, if infallibility is attributed to the pope alone, the rights of the general councils and of the bishops can remain untouched.

"4. Concerning the truth, the manner, the meaning and the compass of this definition, not only the theologians, but even the fathers of the Vatican Council themselves are at variance; so that it can scarcely be otherwise, but that instead of the numerical, or at least, moral unanimity, which, according to the tradition of our predecessors and the history of the general councils, is necessary to a doctrinal definition, a broad diversity of votes would show itself. . . .

"6. The definition of papal infallibility seems to a certain extent to threaten disastrous consequences. For according to the testimony of many bishops it is certain that in various dioceses of Germany, France, Bohemia, Hungary, Transylvania and other countries this doctrine is not known even by name to the Catholic people. I must confess also that in the diocese of Ermland the doctrine in question is never presented catechetically nor from the pulpit, nor has it for a long time past been touched upon in theological lectures. It is to be feared that in the region named the minds of the catholics may become unsettled by this definition, as if at this late date the foundation of the Church and of the true doctrine were to be for the first time definitely fixed. But in other regions which are known to me, and where Catholics live mixed up with the heterodox, still greater dangers threaten the weak. . . . The bishops of various countries with whom I have conversed, nearly all agree with me in opinion, that this definition would, under present political circumstances, and especially in Europe, offer to many governments a reason or at least a pretext, of encroaching more and more upon the rights of the Church."

IX.

Cardinal Rauscher, Archbishop of Vienna, says among other things:

"I openly confess that up to this time I have not been able to overcome the difficulties which are in the way of this definition. Since we must confine ourselves to that which has been believed by all, it will be necessary to prove, that Christians have always, at least *implicite*, believed, that God has so endowed the successors of St. Peter, that that which in the discharge of their apostolical office they decree concerning faith and morals, must be free from error, and accepted by all. Hence it is not sufficient to set aside as irrelevant to the matter the objections derived from authentic historical documents; they must be refuted. If I were to use the evasions, to which not a few theologians have resorted in reference to the Honorius question, I would make myself simply ridiculous. To employ sophisms, seems to me to be unworthy of the episcopal office, and of the subject which ought to be acted upon in the fear of God; mere prudence indeed, forbids the use of such artful tricks. . .

"It would have been possible for the Lord to grant the same assistance of the Holy Ghost to the successors of St. Peter to the end of the world, which was enjoyed by Peter, Paul and John; and to reveal and ordain: As often, after I have taken my apostles up into my kingdom, as there are doubts concerning the rule of faith and practice, apply to the successor of my servant Peter; and whatever he shall tell you, that shall be for you the utterance not of a man, but of the Comforter whom I am to send you. Would not this have been, according to human judgment, the best antidote for the errors, which grow upon the field of the Lord? But it has not pleased the Lord to grant us this protection. . . .

"That in the earliest centuries it was not believed, that the pope had received from God such special authority to teach, as to make general councils superfluous is proven by the utterances of St. Augustine and other church fathers, as well as by the utterances and the practice of the popes themselves.

"The popes have in general faithfully fulfilled the office of strengthening their brethren ; while however a few of them, as is proved by facts, failed to discharge this duty. Honorius did not strengthen his brethren. . . . In regard to the administrator of the sacrament of ordination, Stephen III., Stephen VII., Sergius III. and Leo IX. were in error.

"A very great difficulty arises from the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. If in the definition of matters of faith and morals Boniface VIII. was incapable of error, then the contents of this papal decision, the doctrine of Boniface concerning the divinely ordered and established relation of the ecclesiastical authority to the civil, and the obligations arising from it, are to be believed in as a truth revealed by God. There are some in the present time, who, in order to evade this difficulty, assert, that Boniface VIII. wished to define nothing else than this ; that all men are in duty bound to acknowledge the Roman pope as the head of the Church appointed by Christ. But the supposition, upon which the representatives of this assertion must base themselves, is absurd.

In a treatise (*Observationes*, etc., Vienna, 1870), published during the continuance of the council, Cardinal Rauscher says, p. 14, "An œcumenical council is by no means a parliament, which, under the presidency of the pope, can by a majority of votes make enactments concerning the faith of Christians. For . . . it is necessary to a final decision in matters of faith, that the assent of all the churches be evident ; and, in order to prove this assent, a unanimous, or nearly unanimous resolution of the fathers is required."

X.

Cardinal *Schwarzenberg*, Archbishop of *Prague*, said :

"The obligation of my office constrains me to give my voice as in the presence of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, for the full and entire setting aside of the decree proposed to the Council. I must express this view both with reference to the form and the contents of the decree, and also with reference to the weighty demands of the Church and the times.

"If something is proposed and commanded to be accepted as with divine faith, then one thing must be certain; that either from the Holy Scriptures, or from the constant and divine tradition of the Church,—namely, from the testimonies of the fathers, or at least from the acts and the practice of the Church—it can be established as revealed, as having proceeded from Christ and the Holy Spirit. . . . . The proposed doctrine, that the pope independently of the bishops (for not a word is said of the latter), cannot err in the definition of matters of faith and morals, *does not possess these requirements, which are necessary to the definition of a doctrine; for it is not so evidently contained in the Holy Scriptures or in the divine tradition of the Church, as is beyond all doubt required for a doctrinal definition.*

"On the contrary, not a few utterances and acts of popes and general councils can be cited, which prove that the pope, whenever without the co-operation of the bishops he expresses himself publicly in matters of faith, is liable to err. The councils have subjected doctrinal writings of popes to their own judgment, and either approved and accepted them, or, of which there is a sad instance, condemned them. Just as on the one side the fathers of Chalcedon received with the greatest applause the celebrated epistle of Leo the Great to Flavianus, and greeted it as the doctrine of St. Peter, so on the other hand did the sixth general council condemn the doctrinal epistle of pope Honorius to Sergius. . . . . But if the Church judges infallibly concerning heretical writings, if an œcumenical council with the consent of the pope himself has condemned the public doctrine of a pope as heretical, how can the Vatican Council proclaim the infallibility of the pope when teaching publicly, without at the same time destroying faith in the infallibility of the Church?

"The canon law teaches throughout that a heretical pope can be deposed; aye, that on account of heresy he at once loses the papal dignity. This can be understood only of an external heresy (for a judge does not judge concerning internals); and the doctors of law do not understand this of a pope who secretly, but one of who openly teaches heresy, or contumaciously and publicly contradicts the true doctrine; hence not of the private person of the pope, but of the pope as such.

"*The proposed decree therefore does not by any means contain a catholic doctrine, such as has been believed always, everywhere, and by all.*

"It is in conflict with Christian love and wisdom, by increasing rocks of offense, to impose a greater burden upon believers than they are able to bear, and to provoke and embitter the enemies of the Church. However good the intention of the authors of the *schema* may have been, those who, without the simplicity of the dove which guards the faith of the forefathers against innovation, and without the wisdom of the serpent, which defends from danger and injury, have introduced this doctrine into the council, would, if we should adopt this definition, be responsible to the eternal Judge for the sad consequences, which it is not difficult to foresee."

In a work * written by Prof. *S. Mayer*, at the instance of Cardinal *Schwarzenberg*, and distributed by the latter among the members of the Council, we read p. 19: "If any doctrine, as is clearly the case with the present one, is not so spoken of, *either in the Holy Scriptures or in tradition*, as to make it evident that it was always, everywhere and by all received; if, on the other hand, there are irrefutable arguments to prove the *opposite*, then assuredly such a doctrine cannot become the subject of a doctrinal definition." The work concludes as follows: "He that exalteth himself shall be humbled, is the judgment of a righteous God. After Boniface VIII. had by a solemn definition elevated the authority of the pope over secular kingdoms to the highest pinnacle, there followed a long and ignominious outward humiliation of the holy see. May we not fear if the papal power of the same see is elevated above due measure, that according to the inscrutable counsel of God a spiritual humiliation may follow in the wide-spread estrangement of many from the holy see? And now, ye kings, be wise!"

---

* *De summi pontificis infallibilitate*, Naples, 1870.

XI.

Fürstenbeg, Archbishop of Olmütz, says:

"To give my views openly, I will say that I vote unhesitatingly that the Council issue no decree whatever on this subject, and impose no new yoke of faith.

"In the first place, I have thus far been unable to convince myself, that the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope rests upon such proofs of universality, antiquity and unanimous assent, as to justify us to designate it with absolute certainty a true and special deposit of the catholic faith. For, as Vincentius Lerinensis says, in the Catholic Church we must carefully aim to retain that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. In consideration of this reliable rule of faith, the fathers assembled at the council of Trent, after they had carefully weighed the question concerning the infallibility of the pope, resolved with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, to issue no doctrinal definition, no decree, concerning this point. How much weight is to be attached to the unanimous assent of the fathers assembled in council, was shown by pope Pius IV., who directed his legate presiding over that council, that nothing was to be resolved upon concerning the authority of the pope, unless it had the unanimous assent of the fathers.

"Secondly. Being present at this Synod, to give in virtue of my episcopal office before God and the fathers of the Synod a true and righteous testimony of the faith, *I cannot testify with a good conscience*, that the doctrine presented in the supplement concerning the infallibility of the pope *is a subject of general prevailing faith in my very extensive archdiocese*, so that the clergy and people committed to my care are unanimous in this article. On the contrary, I am deeply impressed with the sad consequences, which a doctrinal definition of this point would involve for the Catholic cause in Moravia, and I foresee with trembling that very many believers would not only take the gravest offence at the introduction of the new doctrine, but would also be exposed to the most imminent danger of suffering shipwreck in their faith."

XII.

Bishop *Hefele*, of *Rottenburg*, says:

"I heartily assent to all what has been said by another father (Cardinal Rauscher) against the opportuneness of this declaration, and concerning the great dangers and disadvantages which would accrue therefrom to the Church, as also concerning the necessity of a unanimous, or, at least, morally unanimous assent of the fathers in reference to doctrinal definitions. I feel myself bound in conscience, however, to add a few things besides. Even if the question of opportuneness should be regarded as of no account, and if also no dangers and prejudices to the Church were to be feared,—but, alas, very great dangers and prejudices *are* to be feared, and they must be gravely considered—the definition of the infallibility of the pope ought nevertheless still to be declined.

"In short, the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope seems to me *to be founded neither in the Holy Scriptures, nor in the tradition of the Church.* Nay, if I do not deceive myself, *the opposite doctrine was held by Christian antiquity*, and not a few objections to the declaration of the new doctrine arise from church history and the expressions of the holy fathers.

"Whenever in the ancient Church controversies and doubts arose concerning a point of faith, then the controversy was settled by bringing forward and comparing the consentaneous utterances of the ancient fathers, as we are told by Vincentius Lerinensis. It was especially examined what had always been believed concerning the disputed point in the apostolical churches at Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc.; and according to the result of this investigation, that which had everywhere, always and by all been believed, was by a doctrinal decision and declaration proposed to the acceptance of believers. *No one of the ancients ever dreamed* that an infallible decision of any disputed point whatever was to be reached, as it were, by a shorter way through the individual declaration of any person whoever he may have been; on the contrary, Vincentius Lerinensis says: 'Let us always cleave unto universality, antiquity, unanimity.'"

XIII.

Bishop Iirsik, of Budweis, says:

"I am by no means convinced that the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope, as it is proposed in the *schema*, can, by clear and unequivocal testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, or by a divine and unbroken tradition of the Church, or by reliable acts and the practice of the Church, be so clearly shown to have been revealed of God, as to allow it with proper certainty, to be doctrinally defined; and to make it possible to show that this article of faith has been always, everywhere, and by all believed, and that therefore it is truly and eminently catholic, and an essential part of the divine deposit. I hold such definition, moreover, to be utterly inopportune and dangerous. . . Foreseeing the ruin of souls which threatens, I will rather die than give my consent to what the decree proposes."

XIV.

Bishop Ketteler, of Mentz, distributed among the members of the Council a work (*Quæstio*, printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, I. 1, etc.), written by an anonymous theologian, in which, among others, the following passages occur:

"Would it not be a new spectacle, and one worthy in the highest degree of the amazement of all centuries, that a general and œcumenical Synod should be called together for the purpose of declaring: That itself and all preceding œcumenical Synods had possessed no original power independent of the sole judgment of the pope; that a general council was merely an outward pageant, a grand solemnity, to invest with greater *pomp* decisions in matters of faith made by the pope as the only witness, the only judge, and the only lawgiver?" (p. 104.)

"It has always been believed that the pope possesses the primacy, and, *with the Church*, the power of teaching infallibly; but this personal and independent infallibility of the pope *has been both in name and substance unknown to the Church,* and has only in these last times *been invented* by certain pious men." (p. 109.)

"It would ill accord with divine wisdom to establish such an infallible teaching office, since it would be the prerogative merely of a single individual, would infringe upon the liberty and authority of all other judges appointed by divine wisdom. and could be maintained only by a continuous miracle. It cannot easily be believed that Christ instituted this personal infallibility, the definition of which can on the one side secure no advantage, while it is calculated on the other side to stir up widespread confusion, to expose the Church to violent storms, and to prove for weak and wavering Catholics a cause of the greatest harm, as it must raise up also between us and all schismatic churches, between us and all Protestants and noncatholics, an everlasting wall of separation." (p. 121.)

"This definition would be something unheard of, and would stand in contradiction with the practice which the Church has always followed in her definitions; since as regards this point so many theologians, so many learned men, so many schools in the past, and still more in the present, have entertained opposite views; since a large part of the Church, a large part of the clergy and the bishops sets itself against this definition, and loudly declares that no decision can be made by the council concerning the point in question without violating to the greatest degree the fundamental rules of an œcumenical Council. This definition, which originated amid such evil auspices, and is carried forward under still worse, threatens to produce a schism within the Church, and a violent and irreconcilable aversion of noncatholics towards us. The supreme power of the pope has never been so illustriously, so obediently and enthusiastically acknowledged by the clergy and the bishops, as in our own times. If that enthusiasm seems for the moment to be declining, it is just this unhappy question that is the cause of it, and if it has borne such evil fruits already in its incipiency, every sober-minded man may not only conjecture, but clearly foresee what it will produce if carried through." (p. 127.)

XV.

The vote on the decree of infallibility, which took place July 13, 1870, resulted as follows: *Placet* (yea) 370; *Non Placet* (nay) 88; *Placet juxta modum* (conditional yea) 62; about seventy votes were absent. Of the German bishops the following voted *Non Placet:* the Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Rauscher; the archbishops of Olmütz, Munich, and Bamberg; the bishops of Mentz, Trieste, Breslau, Augsburg, Budweis, Treves, Osnabrück, Ermland, Rottenburg, Lavant, the apostolical vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian field-provost; the archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne voted *Placet juxta modum.*

Notwithstanding that this vote did not result in such a unanimity as is indispensable to a doctrinal definition, the definition nevertheless took place on the 18th of July. On the day before, July 17, the following paper was addressed by fifty bishops to the pope:

"Most Holy Father! In the General Congregation of the 13th of the present month, we cast our votes on the *schema* of the first doctrinal constitution concerning the Church of Christ.

"It is known to your holiness that 88 fathers, constrained by their conscience and their love to the holy Church, absolved their vote with *Non Placet*, that 62 others voted *Placet juxta Modum*, and that finally about 70 were absent from the congregation, and thus abstained from voting. To these must be added others, who partly on account of sickness, and partly for other sufficient reasons, had returned to their dioceses.

"In this manner our votes became publicly known to your holiness, and to the whole world, and it became evident how many bishops approved of our views; thus also we became aware of the office and duty which devolves upon us.

"Since that time, however, nothing at all has happened which could change our conviction; on the contrary, many and very weighty things have occurred, which do not permit us to desist from our resolution. We therefore declare, that we renew and confirm the votes which we have already given.

"Whilst by this act then we confirm our votes, we also at the same time express our resolution to absent ourselves from the public session which is to be held on the 18th of this month. For that filial piety and reverence which lately brought our legates to the feet of your holiness, does not permit us, in a matter which so clearly appertains to the person of your holiness, to say publicly, and in the very face of our father, *Non Placet.*

"We could, besides, in the solemn session only reiterate the votes already given in the General Congregation.

"We return, therefore, without delay to our folds, where after so long an absence our presence, on account of rumors of war and their own most important spiritual needs, is required in the highest degree, lamenting as we do that in the present sad condition of things we shall find the peace and quiet of consciences also disturbed.

"Meanwhile we commend the Church of God and your holiness, to whom we vow unchanged fidelity and obedience, with all our hearts, to the grace and protection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are, with others who agree with us, though not present, your holiness' most obedient sons."

Of the German bishops the following signed this paper: Cardinal Schwarzenberg, the archbishops of Munich and Olmütz, the bishops of Augsburg, Treves, Rottenberg, and Ermland, the apostolic vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian field-provost.

XVI.

Cardinal Rauscher wrote, Dec. 2, 1870, to a number of German theologians (*vid.* J. Langen, *Das Vaticanische Dogma*, I, 108):

"On the 11th of March a conference was asked for, to consist of several members of the *Deputatio de fide* and a number of those bishops who were of opinion that a profounder investigation was indispensable. At the same time it was shown that a thorough discussion of the question at stake, being so extensively ramified, so difficult and delicate, was not possible in the

General Congregation. The conference, however, was declined. I seized the opportunity offered by the general debate, to point out the necessity of a discussion which should be thorough and embrace all difficulties; my effort, however, was in vain."

XVII.

Abbot Haneberg, lately appointed bishop of Speyer, wrote, August 22, 1870, to Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg:

"The longer I occupy myself with the question, the more closely I compare the reasons for and against infallibility, the more clearly I believe I can see that the ancient Church, that is, the Church of the first eight centuries, knew nothing of this doctrine. Towards the close of this period I meet with this expression of St. Boniface, whose name is borne by our house and our Church: 'The pope, who is himself authorized to judge all, can be judged by no one, except it be that he is found as having departed from the faith.' This utterance is in harmony with canon 11 of the eighth œcumenical council, of 869, and with the fourth and fifth sessions of the council of Constance, which was approved of by at least three popes. In view of these, and perhaps even still stronger reasons, the majority of the bishops of Germany and Austria opposed the definition of infallibility. I have discovered no reason to deviate from our bishops. I had hoped that Rome, taking in view the number of these bishops, and the great number of believers whom they represent, would desist. It did otherwise. Since the 18th of July the doctrine of infallibility stands proclaimed as a dogma of the Church.

"Were all those bishops and theologians who in substance entertained Bossuet's idea of the primacy, and its prerogatives, in error? Is it possible to regard something as untrue on to the 18th of July, 1870, and from that time forward as true? What is to be done?

"Theoretically there are for us who wish to live and die as Catholics only two ways: the one leads to doubt and denial of the validity of the Council, the other to submission. What motives in either direction are offered by the order of the business and the conduct of the Council, is best known to your episcopal grace. That the bishops were not told openly from the beginning: 'The thing aimed at is the extirpation of the theory set up by Bossuet;' that they were not told: 'The object is to elevate the primacy as regards its power both to govern and teach,' is a grave objection.' A still graver one is the want of unanimity, rēgarding, as it does, a long tolerated scholastic question. When at Chalcedon a majority carried its cause over a minority, the matter at stake was the rejection of a doctrine which had never been tolerated in the Church ; here, however, the matter at stake is the rejection of a doctrine * which for a long time has been taught in many schools, and according to our conviction has in its favor the vote of the ancient Church, and of the eighth and sixteenth (of Constance) councils."

Who, looking at the matter theoretically, will deny that the genuineness and validity of the last Vatican resolution may not be controverted ?

Art. V.—THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.†

By President J. Williamson Nevin, D.D.

No one can foresee as yet, with any certainty, what is to be the course and end of the new struggle for reformation, which has been called forth in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church by the late Vatican decree of Papal Infallibility. But of the immense significance of the movement there can be no question. Even if it should prove a present failure, the idea embodied in it cannot be destroyed, and this is of such a nature that no such outward want of success can make it void or vain.

---

* Viz: that of Bossuet.

† 1. Verhandlungen des zweiten Altkatholiken Congresses zu Köln. Officielle Ausgabe Köln und Leipzig, 1872.

2. Deutscher Merkur, Organ für die katholische Reformbewegung in Auftrage der Comites zu Köln und München, herausgegeben von Franz Hirschwälder, Weltpriester.

If not in one way, still most surely then in some other way, it will accomplish God's holy pleasure, and "prosper in the thing whereunto it is sent;" and this end will be found entering profoundly into the most solemn religious and political issues of the age. In this view the movement, without regard to any outward observation to which it has yet come, is of true world-historical importance. Looking at it in all its relations and bearings, retrospective and prospective, it may be doubted if any demonstration in the past history of the Christian world deserves to be considered of greater account. It has its field of action and display thus far mainly in Germany; but it is not for this reason only of German concern. All that concerns German thought and German life, has been since the age of the Reformation, but is now more than ever of concern for the universal life of the world. Not to know this is of itself to be deficient in the proper culture of the age in which we live. The Old Catholic movement thus is all the more worthy of attention, just because it is a German movement thus far, stirring the German nationality to its inmost depths. In Italy, in France, in England, or even in our own United States, it would not mean half so much. As it is, the movement is for the world at large, and has in it a sense which pertains to the ages. It challenges accordingly the most serious regard of the thoughtful among all civilized nations. In this view it is that so much space is given to the subject in the present number of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW; and if what we now say be true, no other apology can be needed for bestowing upon it so large an amount of notice and attention.

The better part of the Roman Catholic world, it is well known, was filled with uneasy apprehension and fear, before the coming together of the Vatican Council in Rome, in the month of December, 1869. The reasons for calling the Council were not made public. They were not found in the general consciousness and will of the Roman Catholic Church. They lay as a portentous mystery, more or less, in the breast of Pius the Ninth, and in the dark policy of his Jesuit counsellors. But enough was known, through the famous *Syllabus*, through the

Pope's organ, called the "*Civilta*," and in other ways, to make it felt widely in Europe, that the occasion was fraught with the most critical interest for the Catholic Church, and for the general peace of the world; that the coming council was to be used as an agency only to ratify and establish the foregone ultramontane conclusion of the Pope's infallibility; and that along with this then, war was to be declared at the same time, in the full spirit of medieval obscurantism, with the entire culture and civilization of the world's modern life in every other view. All through the summer of 1869, the fear of what might come to pass in this way, the feeling of an uncertain and not well defined danger in the near future, lay like the ominous sweltering sense of an approaching thunder-storm, on the soul of Catholic Christendom outside of the Italian Peninsula*—largely in France, but most of all in Germany and Austria. The Pastoral Letter put forth by the German Bishops in joint assembly at Fulda, quoted in the preceding article of this REVIEW, *The*

---

* We find this foreboding of evil strongly expressed by the illustrious convert, J. H. Newman, in England. In one of his letters, he deplores the sad condition into which the Church was brought by an aggressive and presumptuous party; which, he says, had so managed things, that the prospect of a general Council, instead of awakening joy in the minds of good Catholics, had become for them a source only of anxiety and alarm, under the apprehension that the Council was not about to avert a great danger from the Church, but rather to bring upon it new difficulty of the most serious kind. "He is himself troubled, to think of having to defend and explain to others decisions, which, however he might be able to get along with them for himself, it would be still very hard to maintain in the face of historical facts. In other cases, the Church had defined articles of faith only when forced to it by stern and even painful necessity. Even among the best friends of the Church some are ready to give up theology altogether as a bad job, whilst others doubt the capacity of these Bishops called together from all corners of the earth to know what may be suitable for European society, or are displeased with the Holy See for lending its ear to the flatteries of a clique of Jesuits, Redemptorists and Converts. He professes himself to be all the while at a loss what to do; but in the meantime was invoking all the great teachers of the Ancient Church, St. Augustine and others, that through their intercessions the vast impending calamity might be averted. If it were actually God's will, however, that the Papal Infallibility should be decreed, then must it be His will also that the time of victory for His Church be indefinitely postponed, and so there would be nothing left for him (Dr. J. H. Newman) but to bow his head beneath this inscrutable providence." Thus characteristically the great Oratorian, the most thoroughly learned man in Catholic England. All in full antagonism of course to the much lesser light, his once devoted disciple, Archbishop Manning.

German Bishops as Witnesses of the Truth, is a striking testimony to the prevalence of such solicitous apprehension and concern. It was intended to operate as a breakwater to the threatening evil, and is an assurance (resented as offensive at Rome) that the Bishops of German tongue, at least, might be relied upon as pillars of the truth against all Vatican innovations. They pledge themselves solemnly to the German nation, to stand firmly in the coming Council to the three following principles. First: "That the Council should bring in no new doctrine, and no other teaching than what was already inscribed by their faith and conscience on the part of all German Catholics." Secondly: "That no general council may or can ever give the character of doctrine to what is not contained in sacred Scripture or Apostolic tradition." Thirdly: "That only the old and original Christian truth could in any case be proclaimed by the Council, if needful, in clearer light and form." That the Pope's infallibility, and the medieval monstrosity of the *Syllabus*, were articles of belief which did *not* for these good German Bishops, fall within the range and limit of these conservative principles, is abundantly plain from their other declarations given in the articles going before, as well as from the stand which they actually made against the Vatican assumptions in the Vatican Council itself. In a very sorrowful and humiliating way, they made some show of a good fight for the old faith of their own consciences, which with some of them at least was kept up to the end. What followed in the end the world no longer needs to be told. One after another they have committed upon themselves a sort of ecclesiastical *hari-kari*, and have thus done what they could to impart to the Vatican decree a character of *ex-post-facto* œcumenicity, which all the world knows never belonged to it in fact.

Any one looking into the constitution of the Council, and noting the history of its proceedings, may easily see how entirely it lacked the conditions and qualifications that are needed, in the judgment of the Catholic world itself as well as in the light of the simplest common sense, to furnish a valid representation of the mind and will of the Church in any such universal form. The

Vatican Council was neither universal, nor free, nor harmonious. There was no room in it for general discussion or common understanding. There was with it no taking whatever of the real sense and mind of the Church, whether of past ages or of the present time, with regard to the points on which it was called to pronounce judgment. Instead of this, it presents to us from first to last a barefaced endeavor to preclude inquiry, to prevent consultation, to gag free utterance both of speech and press; for all which we have substituted the miserable chicanery, trickery and wire-working of the Italian spirit in its worst form, laboring through long weeks and months of wearisome inanity to secure by diplomatic management, what there was no possibility of reaching in the way of simplicity and godly sincerity; namely, that *moral unanimity* so much talked of, without which Romanists themselves tell us no simple numerical majority can ever be sufficient to establish any article of faith. There was no such unanimity in the Vatican Council. All the unanimity that can be attributed to it (and even this as we have seen dates in part only from a later time) comes of the Pope's outward dictation enforced by his army of Italian priests. As indeed why should it be otherwise, if the Pope be infallible? Had not the council of bishops been convened to make this a dogma of the Church by œcumenical decree? And must not their decree for such purpose be itself infallible? But how could it be that, except as the Council might be in truth the mouthpiece simply of the Pope himself, the only fountain of all such infallibility among men? It is only in keeping with the new order of things, therefore, that the decree of his own autocracy and self-sufficiency was by Pio Nono submitted to the council, and engineered through the council, all in his own name, with a simple *sacro approbante concilio* tacked to it in the loosest sort of form, not for *his* credit apparently (that needed no such consenting vote), but for the credit wholly of the venerable body of episcopal subordinates and proxies, who had come together from the ends of the earth to do implicit homage to their magnificent chief in this most passively obedient way.

Mere superiority of numbers it was, from the beginning, that gave the Council the character of a machine in the hands of the Pope and his satellites, to grind into powder finally the moral superiority which lay wholly on the opposite side. Only look at the following: "The representation of the several nations and church sections in the Council may furnish instructive reflection. Frenchmen and Germans have to exercise themselves here in the virtues of humility and modesty, and to learn how little they signify in the Catholic Church, when it comes to doctrine and legislation. There is the diocese of Breslau with 1,700,000 Catholics; its Bishop has not been chosen here into a single commission; whereas the 700,000 inhabitants of the existing Church-State, are represented by 62 bishops, and in all commissions the Italians form from the half to two-thirds. For the kingdom of God, in which the least is greater than John the Baptist and all the prophets, lies confessedly between Montefiascone and Terracina, and whosoever has seen the light of the world in Sonnino or Belletri, in Ceccano, Anagni or Rieti, he has been even in the cradle predestinated *imperio regere populos.* True it has not yet succeeded with the 62 bishops of this elect land and people to establish even the most modest measure of morality in their towns and villages; whole regions and districts remain still in notorious fellowship with brigands; but about such things the council need not trouble itself. There are the arch-dioceses of Cologne with 1,400,000 Catholics, of Cambray with 1,300,000, of Paris with two million; but of the 68 Neapolitan and Sicilian bishops in the Council four alone are sufficient to nullify these prelates together with the five million Germans and French standing behind them. So the twelve million Catholics of Germany proper are represented in this Council by fourteen voices. To express the relation one might say: In church matters twenty Germans are not worth quite so much as one Italian. And should any German take it into his head, that his nation, with its numerous theological seminaries and its learned theologians, ought rightly to have some weight with the Council, he need only come here to be effectually cured of that fancy. In all Italy, with the exception of Rome, there is not a single real theological faculty. Spain also gets along without higher theological schools, and without theology, but here in this council, nevertheless, some hundreds of Italians and Spaniards are lords, and born teachers, and dictators of faith for all the nations that belong to the Church!" *Quirinus*, Letter IX.

For a brief enumeration of some of the damaging and disenabling conditions under which the council was held, the reader is referred to what is said with regard to the subject on pages 135 and 136 of the last number of the Mercersburg Review, in the strong article *Conscience and the Vatican*, translated from Professor Reinkens. To this we add here another fuller and still more telling picture, which was brought out during the Council itself in a French paper, the *Moniteur Universel*, by a vigorous pen in Rome, attributed to one of the French Bishops, and which created at the time, we are told, quite a sensation in French circles. It is quoted here from the *Römische Briefe vom Concil* by Quirinus, Letter XXIV.

"The Council of Trent," says this French writer, "determined for itself its own order of business; for the present Council all has been different; all was prescribed beforehand, and imposed upon the fathers, by the Pope; even the secretaries and scrutators were named in advance. No initiative was allowed to the bishops; the commission of overtures was formed from the most zealous infallibilists and from members of the curia; the final decision, however, being reserved for the Pope. Those presenting overtures were not suffered to explain or defend them, so that the freedom of the bishops to make propositions was rendered altogether illusory. By the formation of the four commissions chosen from Roman lists all decisive labors are thrown into the hands of the few infallibilists whom the curia has selected for this purpose; while 700 bishops are excluded from all part in such business; among them all the Germans who signed the address from Fulda to the Pope, and the most distinguished French prelates. In general, all the bishops that were not known as decided infallibilists, have been systematically excluded from the commissions. It was quite otherwise at Trent, where all the fathers, divided into four congregations, could take real part in the proceedings. To this is added now the monstrous disproportion of national representation; the altogether enormous and all-absorbing preponderance of the Italians, still farther strengthened by the whole troop of apostolic vicars, which, without any legal form, can be turned out from the Propaganda at any time. So it is that the Italian bishops alone are more numerous, than all the French, German, Hungarian and North American taken together, although these represent an almost three times larger population. Through the weakness of the two French Cardinals who should have taken the lead, *Bonnechose* and *Mathieu*, the attempt to unite the French bishops in a national group failed. Bonnechose consulting Antonelli on the subject got for answer: Only in groups of fifteen, or at short twenty bishops, may the French meet together. The evil of this was soon apparent. The bishops have been forced by the will of the Pope to hold their sessions in a hall, where a third part of them at least could not understand a word that was spoken; so that for example, Cardinal di Pietro after a long time declared, he had not yet actually comprehended a single address; while another Cardinal affirmed, that of all the addresses not forty words had reached him. A truly thorough investigation, a living exchange of thought and counter-thought, is here out of the question. No speaker may hope to produce an effect on such an audience. Thus it happened that the first *schema*, a document of 150 pages, was spoken upon for many weeks in a general way, without its coming to a special discussion of any of the single articles, and in spite of the numerous speakers also without the bringing of any one point to a clear conclusion. The only effect was, great loss of time, much bodily weariness, and deep discouragement. If the object had been to sicken the assembly of all addresses even to loathing, it could not have been contrived better. If only the fathers might have read the discourses which they could not hear, but, alas, neither must they be read; not even at their own cost may the bishops have their overtures and speeches printed. Many in this way, from the certainty of not being heard, have lost the power of expressing their views altogether. Vast preparations were made in the two years before the opening of the Council, amounting to stuff for ten councils; but it is only brought out for the bishops in fragments, so that there is wanting with them all insight into the consideration and meaning of single determinations. Seven hundred bishops in this way have had set before them a previously fabricated council, which like a woven pattern they are now forced to unravel again. In this work, having no means allowed them for preliminary common understanding, the body has become in large part deaf-dumb; and has got itself fairly jammed into a narrow pass, from which it can never extricate itself without an entire change in its order of business. No man is able to say how it is to be with the discussion of the single articles of the several *schemata*, and yet the Council, in issuing decrees that are to bind the world under pain of an accompanying anathema, is bound surely to weigh every word in the most careful way."

So much from this French witness. It is a graphic sketch, showing clearly the spiritual impotency of the Vatican Council for the work it was called to do, so far as all the laws of ordinary human intelligence and conscience are concerned. What shall we say then? Must we believe that these ordinary conditions of right human judgment were not needed in this case, and that their absence only served to make room the more fully for the presence of the Divine Spirit with which the Bishop of Rome claims to have been endowed for the occasion? That seems to be virtually what we are required to believe by the modern ultramontane would be task-masters of our faith. The authority of the Vatican Council had in this view nothing to do with the capacity of the body for its work: the all-sufficiency of the Pope makes that all right.

And more yet; this all-sufficiency of the Pope has nothing to do with the personal capabilities of the Pope in any other view for the exercise of his high and mighty office.* It is a magical appendix belonging to the office itself, which all men are bound to accept as the rule and measure of their faith without regard to any conditions whatever holding in the material object of their faith otherwise considered. All hinges on the form of the faith, as an act of blind submission to the authority of him who claims to be the mouth-piece of our Lord Jesus Christ in Rome. Were he a Caiaphas or a Balaam, he must still be trusted in implicitly as being for the time the infallible high-priest and prophet of God. We mean here no caricature. The Vatican decree if we understand it, comes just to this, and nothing less than this. A hard saying, intelligence and conscience may exclaim ; who can hear it ? But then intelligence and conscience are roughly reminded that the unbelieving Jews (John vi. 60), used the very same language toward Christ Himself; and that the first law of the Christian kingdom is the bringing into captivity of all thought and intelligence to the obedience of Christ.

---

* There have been Popes in past time more hard to get along with, in this view, than Pius IX. Even in his case, however, it requi.es a very stout faith, to jion

The harder the cost of faith in this view, we are told, the greater the merit and the power of faith. That indeed is the

---

the conception of infallibility firmly and calmly with what seem to be the incommensurable personal qualities of the man otherwise considered. Take him in his ordinary human character, and he is represented as having been always noted for a certain frivolity of spirit joined with a self-willed impatient temper. He never had any taste for theological studies. Gregory XVI. had no confidence in him, and predicted that if he ever became pope he wou'd ruin the Church. Originally in the interest of the Liberals, he threw himself after his flight to Gaeta into the hands of the Jesuits, who now use him as clay is used by the potter. They relieve him of the trouble of thinking. They do his science for him by proxy. Pa saglia declared that even after he had signed the decree of the *Immaculate Conception* he knew not what it meant. It is known generally in Rome, that he reads no book, but only small pamphlets and some journals. With all this he is given to free talk, in a loose, imprudent way. "For my part," said a Roman ecclesiastic to Prof. Friedrich in Rome, "I need no other argument that the Pope is not infallible than this, that I have never in all my life met with a man who was less exact with the truth, than just Pius IX." His superstition knows no bounds. He fancies himself the subject of special inspirations, which have for him the force of fixed ideas, and go farther with him at times, even in serious affairs, than any other reason. These things are drawn from Friedrich's *Tagebuch.* Now the problem is, how to *think* the endowment of personal infallibility into such a personality. Pius himself finds no difficulty in the matter. "When I was the Abbot Mastai," he tells us, "I believed in papal infallibility, but now as Pope Mastai I *feel* it." It is with him a matter of intuition.

very sense of the famous or rather infamous *sacrificio dell' intelleto*, which the military spirit of the school of Loyola has now made to be the soul of all religion in the Roman Church. It means the slaughter of the understanding, the immolation of the will, the conversion of all free personality on the part of men into the passive obedience of a corpse. And for such faith, it must be confessed, the late Vatican decree offers an admirable lesson to begin with. It is here *multum in parvo*, or rather all in a nutshell. That it goes against conscience, and delivers reason bound hand and foot over into the hands of the uncircumcised Philistines, only fits it the more to serve its own end; only makes it a more suitable engine for grinding into the souls of men the cadaverous faith of the Jesuit.

That the action of the Vatican Council, revealing to the world such a complete triumph of Ultramontanism, should have called forth open resistance and protest in the Roman Catholic Church, is not to be considered strange. The only wonder is, considering what had place before and during theCouncil, that the opposition should not have been more widespread and serious than it has yet proved to be in fact. Nothing could well go farther to show the dread power of the system which has now got the Papacy fully into its hands, and whose attitude at this time amounts to a bold defiance hurled toward the powers of the world's civilization in every other form.

In France, the voices that were heard from high places against the new doctrine before the 18th of July, 1870, have since ceased to be heard. The Sorbonne and the Episcopate have together wheeled into line. The memory of Bossuet is dishonored, and the Gallican liberties are turned into reproach. How it has fared with the German Bishops, we have already seen. They recanted, all of them, their own good confession made before their going to Rome, and also during their stay in Rome; some of them not without much tribulation of spirit; and are now moving heaven and earth to oppose and put down the very truth which they themselves before confessed. And with some at least of our North American prelates (in Canada and the United States), it is known there has been just the same tergiversation. Disgusted with the course of things in Rome, they have learned to see nevertheless, since their return, that all was right, and are now ready to insist on the infallibility of Pius IX, as no less certain for faith than the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All this is marvellous; and it is not strange that zealous Romanists see in it an argument for the œcumenicity of the late Council, a sort of divine seal openly impressed upon it by the hand of the Almighty Himself. The world has not known a larger council, nor one of apparently more overpowering force. But all depends on the nature and character of this force. Has it been of heaven or of men? Is the unity that has followed it a living unity, or is it rather the unity of death? There is room for this question: and it may be so answered that the present seeming triumph of Ultramontanism shall be construed into a sign of weakness rather than strength, a handwriting of judgment on the wall rather than a bow of promise in the cloud. This construction has been put upon it in fact by the new race of reformers which has sprung up in the German Catholic Church. They see in it only the doom of Belshazzar and the fall of Babylon.

This old Catholic Movement, as it is called, dates from the 18th of July, 1870, when the Vatican Council pronounced the infallibility of the Pope a necessary article of the Christian faith. It grew forth from the integrity of those who had previously protested against the introduction of this dogma as subversive of the ancient Catholic truth, and who now held themselves bound to stand firm to that good testimony, even when their own ecclesiastical leaders shamefully fell away from it, and when confession was seen to mean for them nothing less than martyrdom of the soul in the most serious form. As Prof. Reinkens shows with great force in the article translated for last number of this Review, it was through the birth throes of *conscience*, the great question of personal spiritual responsibility over against the imposition of blind outward authority, that the new strange life made its appearance in the Catholic world; and what served in this way to originate the movement at first, has been the true silent power of its growth ever since, as it is that also which imparts to it all its significance for the time to come.

The memorable Letter of Dr. Döllinger to the Archbishop of Munich (a new careful translation of which precedes our present article) is of special historical interest as related to this latest effort for the reformation of the Catholic Church. No man has stood higher heretofore in the confidence and admiration of his own communion; as indeed no one has been more of an ornament and credit to it in the eyes of the general Christian world. His venerable age, his vast historical learning, his exemplary Christian piety, his high position, all have contributed to make his Letter an object of universal attention. Its words have gone forth to the ends of the earth, and though very calm and quiet in themselves, have fallen upon the ears of men, like thunder; louder by far than the *brutum fulmen* of excommunication with which they were immediately followed on the head of their author from the high and mighty prelate to whom they were addressed. As related to the old Catholic Movement, this Letter of Döllinger is more than an ordinary spoken or written word; it is a grand dramatic deed, like Martin Luther's nailing of his theses on the church door in Wittenberg. He is a very different man, indeed, from Luther; but it is quite possible (under God's ordering) that this act of his, in the years hereafter, may be looked back upon as of no less world-historical meaning than the Wittenberg act itself.

Its importance in such ultimate view is not to be determined, of course, by the mere beginnings of the movement to which it belongs. These have not been of a character to overpower the judgment of the world at once in their favor. The first demonstrations made against ultramontanism in Bavaria, have not come to as much as they seemed at first to promise. On the part of the government, especially, there has been a serious backing down of zeal, a reactionary policy tending to demoralize the course which it first affected to favor as its own. All the force of the thoroughly organized and drilled regimen of the Jesuits (the fruit of a whole generation's previous training) making itself felt in the meantime on clergy and people, has come in to create the impression of overwhelming mass and weight on the other side. All this has led many to look upon the Old Catholic cause as a failure. Its enemies have taken pains to speak of it in this way, in a tone of insulting derision, like that of Tobiah the Ammonite in the ears of the proud Sanballat, (Nehemiah iv. 1-3.) But not these only; the friends of the movement also, in different parts of the world have been led too generally to think of it, and speak of it, with similar distrust. It has not fallen in with this or that preconceived notion of what church reformation ought to be; it has shown itself too tame, too cautious, too slow; it has not come with sufficient noise and observation. And so it is set down for a well-intentioned fiasco, a stream doomed to run itself out in the sand.

And yet we do not need surely to be told that noise and tumult are not always the demonstration of deep and lasting power. How often is silence in fact the argument of the greatest strength. The kingdom of God, it is said, cometh not with outward observation. In the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, it is "a stone cut out without hands," which nevertheless having broken in pieces the kingdoms of the world, "became itself a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." This does not prove that the Old Catholic movement is destined certainly to break down the image of the Roman Papacy in the end. But it does show this much at least, that the impatient judgments pronounced against it thus far, whether by Romans or Protestants, have in them no sort of conclusive force. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts," is a prophetic word, which, if the movement should turn out to have been indeed of God, would be in no sense contradicted, but only verified and made good by what is thus objected against it as its present show of weakness.

No one seems to feel this more fully than the apostle of the movement, Dr. Döllinger himself. There is not in him a particle of the impetuosity of Ronge; nothing in him even of the impassioned ardor of Pere Hyacinthe. The great theologian of Germany is reserved, calm, almost at times frigid. He is not disturbed by events, whether favorable or unfavorable. In conversation he speaks but little, and with simplicity. His words are distinguished always, for their force, though rarely for their eloquence. He is more passive in his conviction than active, throwing himself on the force of ideas, and quietly leaving results with God. Fault has been found with him for this; but there is that in it also which is suited to inspire respect both for the man and for his cause. On being complimented on a certain occasion for his heroic opposition to the usurpations of Rome, he replied: "I neither expect nor fear anything from that; the world congratulates me as if my position were something great; I am but as a duck thrown into the water which can do no otherwise than swim." The abuse of the ultramontane journals he allows to pass without reading; "I know the authors," he says, "and that is for me enough. They can make of me a saint or a cannibal; in neither case will they speak the truth." One having spoken to him sorrowfully of the defection of a friend who had vigorously combated the infallibility decree, his answer was: "I see that troubles you, but it does not disturb me, I am used to it. These bishops, and these theologians, who were one thing yesterday and are another thing to-day, remind one of acrobats on a tight rope, who must do all sorts of turning to preserve their equilibrium." When he heard of the final adhesion of Mgr.Maret to the Vatican dogma, he repeated the two lofty lines of Juvenal:

Summum crede nefas animam preferre pudori,
Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.

A great man truly, and worthy of the cause he represents; although no one can be more sensible than he is himself, that the cause is in no sense dependent on either his own name or his own life. He is in the 75th year of his age. "I am an old man," was his language more than a year since to a friend; "I shall not live long enough to see all that is coming. But what has begun well must end well; there will be a radical reform of the Church; *of that I am sure.*"

The work has in fact gone forward apart from the sage of Munich, and to a large degree independently of his counsel or guidance. Younger and more vigorous men, thoroughly fitted for the task by natural talent, full education, and self-sacrificing devotion, have taken hold of it, and urged it onward with what must be considered in the circumstances a truly wonderful success. It has gone far beyond Munich and Bavaria, and is felt all over Germany, and into Switzerland and Austria. Not yet as an outward whirlwind, certainly (unless we choose to take the blustering wrath of the Romanists in certain quarters for that;) but what is much better, as a powerful leaven, that may be found more effectual for its object in the end than any whirlwind however strong.

If there might have been any doubt of this living and progressive, though comparatively silent character of the work previously, the meeting of the Old Catholic Congress last September in Cologne was well suited to put an end to it. The world has seldom seen a more imposing or solemn religious convention. Such was the view taken of it by intelligent observers present on the occasion, from this country and from England, who reported at the time their highly favorable judgment through the press; and the official account of the proceedings which has since appeared, abundantly confirms their testimony. This official account is in fact a volume of nearly 250 pages, got up in the best style and with the greatest care, which with its full stenographic reports may be said to daguerreotype for the reader the entire occasion, so that it is made to pass before him in its details very much as if he had been personally present. And few books of the sort certainly, made up of business minutes, debates and speeches, may compare with it for commanding interest and solid instruction. Once introduced to its pages, no one at all awake to the present state of things in the world, can fail to follow it with more than ordinary attention to the end. It is indeed a most suggestive study for the times; for the significance of that Cologne meeting reached in fact, as the thoughtful reader is forced to feel, far beyond its own immediate occasion, far beyond the three days of its memorable sitting, and far beyond the goodly old town of Cologne in which it was held. It took hold in truth morally on the ends of the earth, and had to do with the deep foundations of the world's life. In this respect it was œcumenical and world-historical, quite as much as the Vatican Council itself, or as the Evangelical Alliance is expected to be (the great antithesis of the Vatican,) which is to sit next September in New York. Not since the age of the Reformation at least (and perhaps not even then,) has there been a more imposing or momentous demonstration in the bosom of the Christian world, called forth by the inmost needs of the Christian world in the same broad and profound view.

The outward composition of the body was all that could be asked to make it respectable. Upwards of four hundred regular delegates took part in its business proceedings from the beginning; chosen representatives of the cause from Germany and Austria; to whom must be added quite a list of guests, as they were called, partly also from Germany and partly from Great Britain, America, France, Italy, Russia and Hungary. Among these guests figure conspicuously the Anglican bishops, Brown of Ely and Wordsworth of Lincoln, together with Whittingham of Maryland, from this country. An unusual amount of intelligence showed itself in the assembly. Besides its four business sessions, two public meetings were held in the large Gürzenich Hall, where a succession of addresses were made to vast audiences of the most stirring and telling kind. One is surprised to meet with such a constellation of new names, bursting here suddenly into view, and throwing their light far and wide over the Christian world. It is something we were not prepared to look for from the Roman Catholic life of Germany; and it goes far of itself in this view to create a strong impression in favor of the Old Catholic cause, as having been able to draw what seems to be thus the better part of that life into its service. It is no wonder that the distinguished strangers present from England and America were struck with the imposing character of the Council and its proceedings, and felt themselves constrained to speak of it with admiration and respect. One thing it showed clearly. The Old Catholic movement in Germany was not in weak hands, and it was much more than an excitement suddenly got up and as suddenly to pass away. There was mind in it, method and power; and it was able to take care of itself, as it meant also to take care of itself, and to follow its own course, with full independence of all outside guidance or help. Döllinger was there, and was hailed on his appearance with a hearty cheer as the Nestor of the cause; but he only spoke once, briefly on a secondary point in debate, and then the vote of the body went against him.

The business of the convention had been well prepared for it with great care and labor, before it came together, by commissioners previously appointed for the purpose, in the form of general schemes which were published and in the hands of the delegates: so that they were ready to act promptly on all questions claiming their action as soon as they came forward. To this must be added a most excellent order or method of deliberation, and the advantage of such rare judgment and tact in the presiding officer, Herr Prof. von Schulte, as has been seldom met with (by the confession of all) in the conduct of such bodies. The convention in this way acccomplished a great deal in a short time. There was no room in it for desultory declamation or mere buncombe talk. There was no confusion or chaos in its proceedings. All meant business; serious, public business; and of such business there was transacted an amount, that for form and quality well deserves to be a study, and that cannot fail, the more it is studied, to command attention and admiration. It is not just what outside criticism, at home or abroad, may have impatiently supposed it ought to have been; but it is only for this reason all the more worthy of regard. The promise of the work lies in what we may call its indifference to immediate, noisy or flashy results of any kind, in the breadth of its circumspection, in the depth of its penetration, in its slow caution, in its reliance upon the power of ideas, in its secure faith with regard to the future.

We cannnot go here, of course, into any consideration of the work of the Congress in its details. Our concern with it at present is under the general view simply, of the light it has served to throw on the sense of the Old Catholic movement, in the history of which it holds now so conspicuous a place.

This movement, we are told, was born of a meeting held informally in Nuremberg, not long after the Vatican decree. It came to a more formal organization afterwards, in the Munich Congress of 1872. But all was still necessarily more or less provisional and tentative in its character. The forces at work in it were as yet largely obscure, indefinite, and so of course chaotic. Could the chaos ever grow into a creation? It was easy and not unnatural to answer this question in the negative. Romanists took pleasure in speaking of it as a failure; and Protestants, in Germany and elsewhere, were very generally inclined to think of it in the same way. But the Congress of Cologne taught the world a different lesson. The movement, it appeared there, was neither dead, nor moribund, nor in a state of sleep; but was powerfully alive and awake; and more than this, gaining force and ready to pass from its first stage of chaos into its higher second stage of clear, self-conscious, intelligible order. It has been like a vision of the Church coming forth once more from the catacombs. All felt this who were in Cologne at the time of the Congress; and no one anywhere can help feeling it who has made its transactions a matter of study since.

"I bring you greeting," says Prof. Huber, addressing the immense audience assembled in the Gürzenich Hall "from Bavaria and Munich, a greeting that betokens unbroken courage and self-sacrificing endurance for the great cause which has brought us here together. As the Old Catholics of Ger many came before the nation a year ago, to declare the ideas that move them, and the end for which they strive, so is it here again to-day. When I look back over the year which has since passed, I find it a year of variable fortunes, a year of tumultuating conflict, in which many victories have been won, though not without some disappointments. Altogether, however, our success has been so great, that in the face of every discouragement both hope and courage may well be animated for the fight which is yet to come. On the field of general public opinion our enemy is everywhere discomfited; there is no thinking man who would yield himself in faith to the decrees they have tried to force upon us from Rome. Nor is it simply with the cultivated class, or in cities that such mistrust prevails; among our plain country population also there is felt a gnawing doubt, more and more, of the Roman hierarchy. A dark suspicion has entered into the soul of our people: there is going forward in the soul of the German people just what our hierarchists fear, a movement that is shaking the whole false structure which they have sought to prop up with the decrees of the Vatican. But this negative movement is not all that is at work in the popular mind. Along with it goes another that is positive, and by which the question of true religion is brought to the front of free public discussion. The best and most earnest minds of the nation are now grappling with this subject. What the indolence of other times forgot and overlooked, is forced by the events of the present time more and more upon the world's consideration; this namely, that nihilism no less than superstition injures the being of a people in its inmost marrow. And now all these earnest minds, these deeply thoughtful spirits, which are inquiring into the principles that lie at the ground of man's existence, are for us so many allies in our work. For two years past the German nation has been put upon the study of theology, as perhaps not before since the age of the Reformation; especially in Germany is the question of the Church explored. The book of Church History is spread out before the people, and all may read in it who wish to read. We are learning to know the causes of the wrong state of things from which we now suffer; we are learning the causes of the divisions that rend the heart of Christendom. And finding that it is to the passions of men and much hasty error these mournful divisions are to be ascribed, we are all touched with a sentiment that looks actively toward reconciliation. These, my honored hearers, are the positive workings of our activity. A new, moral, earnest spirit, a spirit of placability and peace, has been awakened, and we can trust this spirit, that it will in due time complete the work in which it has become our glorious duty to take part."

"Allow me now," the speaker goes on to say, "to turn from these general considerations to something special. I have brought you greeting from Bavaria, and you may be interested perhaps to know how it fares with our movement there. When we held our first religious service a year ago in the Gasteig Chapel, a small out-of-the-way church, it was an anxious question with us whether people enough would follow us to fill the little building; and lo! not only has the small church been constantly filled, but there has been a call for more room. It is a felt need in Munich, that the Old Catholics should have there a large church. Had our Government shown its liberality towards us more in deeds and less in words, had it granted us one of the churches which it could have given us—I speak from the fullest conviction—half Munich would be openly joined to us this day. And as it is, thousands as things are having been kept back from such open adhesion, I can proclaim it still as a truth, no less certain and sure, that neither the people of Munich nor the Bavarians belong any more to our foes. All over the country congregations are springing up. We have a flourishing one in Mehring. Another has been formed in Kempten, and from there the whole Allgäu is drawn into the compass of our activity. In Straubing, Passau, Regensburg, Simbach, Erlangen, you can find steps taken toward congregations. In Nuremberg, Fürth, Bayreuth, in all the cities of Bavaria, we are met with the same phenomenon. The entire Palatinate is overspread with our adherents. And as our friends were called last winter to the mass meeting, in Kiefersfelden, the country people of the Inn valley and of the mountains poured in by thousands to hear the word of truth. Like a cloud the movement rolled over the valley of the Inn; as lightning it passed from Kufstein to the foot of the Brenner. A flourishing congregation belongs to us here in Cologne, and from Crefeld to Constance all is in motion. In Switzerland our friends are actively at work, and though the outward show amounts not yet to much, the course of things inwardly is full of promise. On the extreme eastern boundary of the German Empire we have congregations, served by Pastor Grunert, Professor Michelis and Dr. Wollman; and all Austria is in like manner apprehended by the Old Catholic spirit."

This is a long extract, but it serves better than anything we could present in a different way to bring into view what this Old Catholic spirit had brought to pass when it reached the epoch of its Second Congress in Cologne, and what in the circumstances this Congress was, then, for the promotion of its further progress. The spirit which was in the movement from the beginning, came now more clearly to harmony and right understanding with itself; and from that time since, it has been working steadily and widely in one direction and another toward the same general end. Its power of self-regulation and self-restraint in this view has been wonderful. Among so many acting on their own judgment, and excited with the idea of wrong and reformation, it was but natural to look for more or less irregularity, precipitation and excess. But this has not taken place. There has been no iconoclasm in the work; it has given birth as yet to no Münzer, Carlstadt or Ronge.* Its principle is: Abide in the ship. Its great law: Organization first; then the reconstruction of true church authority; and then the doing away of disorders and abuses as the right life of the Church may require. Every step is taken with due regard to the demands of law, both canonical and civil, and with an eye to the maintenance of all church rights, regarded as belonging now to the Old Catholics in their character of being the Catholic Church in its only true and right form. "He that believeth shall not make haste," is the motto in this view, which is acting like a charm to moderate all things and keep them in the right direction.

---

* It betrays most shallow thinking, whether among Romanists or false Protestants, to see in the Old Catholic movement a renewal simply of the "German Catholic" excitement headed by Ronge and Czersky in the year 1845. We denounced it at the time, as a scandal to Protestantism, that so many of our religious papers were ready to join hands with such a cause, as of one nature with the work of the Reformation in the 16th century. "Ronge," we then declared, "is no reformer, but a radical only, of the worst stamp. Like Luther he has indeed cast off the authority of Rome. But the resemblance of the two cases is merely in outward form. Luther was full of positive life; Ronge is negative wholly, and destitute of all faith in Christianity as a real life-revelation in the world. Luther stood in the element of the objective, and felt himself to be the passive organ only of the true and proper historical life of the Church itself; Ronge is supremely subjective, unhistorical and full of blind self-will. Luther was himself the first central, and in some sense fontal, product of the vast spiritual revolution in which he led the way; it came to the birth with deep convulsive throes, in his separate personal consciousness, before it revealed itself in the rest of the Church already ripe for the change. Ronge stands in no such relation to the inmost religious life of the age, in which he affects to play the spiritual hero." *Mystical Presence*, p. 151. All this was soon confirmed by the judgment of history. It has no application whatever to the cause of Döllinger and the Old Catholics. If ever a movement in the world was free from mere human interest, passion and self-will, showing itself the product of objective powers, and in that way truly historical, we seem to have it here.

Such is the tone of wisdom that runs remarkably through the opening address of Prof. V. Schulte, on taking the chair as President of the Cologne Congress. "We have this year," he says, "a greater and more difficult task than in the past year. Then we were still struggling for our existence; we knew not yet our position in the world; we had not got ourselves into constitution. The main point, that which in any case must appear the most vital for our movement, was on to the end of the first (Munich) Congress, completely in the dark, I mean the formation of congregations. Had the time come for it? There was room for doubt on the subject; but there was room on the other side also for the view, that the exigency had come to such a pass as to justify an advance to this great practical measure. It was resolved, accordingly, to go into the organization of congregations. We have to do now also with similar grave questions; and we must see that in dealing with them we avoid all self-contradiction, and hold ourselves steadily to the ground we have taken with good conscience and full faith from the beginning. We belong to the Catholic Church. The primary cause of our rising lay in this, that we were required to accept doctrines which were not God's word, but were only the invention of men put forward as the word of God. That was the *immediate occasion*. We have all known, however, that the true heart of Christendom has been for centuries demanding more in the way of church reform; and that the holding back of this *more* is what has produced division in the Christian Church. We know that the oldest division had its ground, not in religious questions, but mainly in hierarchical pride. Our mission seems to mean then, that we should bend our whole strength to restore the sundered unity of the Church at large. But we must be aware that such an aim presupposes a clear perception of the dividing issues, and is not to be promoted by precipitation, or through the use of empty phrases and outward declamation. We have still other tasks. Our stand-point is: It is *not we* that have gone out of the Catholic Church; we hold fast to the Catholic faith; they have thrust us out and then declared us to be apostates. And who are *they*, that have done this? Men, of whom we must say that they *have been* bishops of the Catholic Church, regularly chosen and rightly acknowledged; but of whom we are now bound in conscience also to say, that having given in their adhesion to the new Vatican doctrine, the cause of all this rupture in the Church, they have lost for us the authority of bishops—we can obey them no longer. It was this going over of all the bishops, the entire episcopate, in *outward appearance* at least, to the Roman camp, which brought upon us the necessity that lies at the ground of our whole movement. We are in a strait (*Nothstand*) of practical life, of conscience and also of law. We have no tribunal; we cannot bring our bishops, or the bishop of Rome, to account for having introduced an innovation that tramples the church under foot. We have no œcumenical council; and being thus without resort, there is nothing left for us but to do for ourselves what church right allows, by carrying out practically the rules of this right. Our need goes still farther: not only the bishops, but the greatest part of the clergy also, the organs of the bishops, are with the new cause; and the consequence is, that in many districts and dioceses Old Catholics are cut off from the exercise of their religion. The sacraments are refused them, they are insulted in the churches, they are excommunicated from the pulpits. Such need justifies at once the provision of proper pastoral care for our congregational life. But this must be under right regulation. We have behind us the experience of a year, and the propositions now before us aim at a more exact organization. They are in gross and whole very moderate; and I believe nothing will help our cause more than our holding fast with both firmness and moderation, to what I have now described as our true stand-point."

We have here what may be taken as the key-note, not only of all that took place at the Cologne Congress, but of all that the movement has brought to pass since. As far as we can understand it through the pages of the *Deutscher Merkur*, it seems to be following out steadily on all sides the peculiarly distinctive programme laid down for it by its leaders, with quiet but sure success, and is in a fair way of reaching in due course of time the order that is required to give it the full acting powers of a reconstructed Catholic Church. This is felt to require bishops and a general council. Only when thus organized in full, will the body be considered competent to go into the work of reforming particular abuses; the business, which so many have thought the movement should have been concerned with from the beginning, and for the neglect of which its leaders have been charged with unfitness for their task in different quarters. And only then also will the way be open for moving positively in that great work of the reintegration of Christendom, which as we have just seen Schulte (but not less Döllinger, Friedrich, Reusch, Huber, Reinkens, Michelis, Knoodt, and every one of this noble band of confessors) dares to look forward to as the highest aim of the work with which they are engaged.

But strange to say, this crowning measure of an episcopate is itself approached only in the most slow and cautious way. There is no thought evidently (as with too many of our Anglicans) of any magical potency in the office and name of bishops, as though all right church-life must start here, and this were needed first of all to authenticate and uphold our apostolic faith. There is a commission appointed (made up of seven strong names, Friedrich, Hasenclever, Maassen, Reusch, Michelis, Schulte, and Wülfing), to whom is entrusted the duty of determining when and how the business of choosing a bishop shall go forward. We see it stated, that instead of a single bishop it is proposed now to have at once three—one for North Germany, a second for South Germany, and the third for Switzerland. But why such holding back in the matter of the episcopate ? From the feeling, that however necessary it may be as the cap-stone of a complete church structure, such structure requires first of all a certain organization and consistency in itself, as it were from below upward, to make the imposition of the cap-stone entirely safe. These men are Germans after all, not Anglicans ; and their freshly recent experience of bishops has been of a sort, that may well excuse them for regarding the office with a certain amount of jealousy and distrust. In any case, their bishops, as they are careful to inform the world, are not to be lords nor men of high outward estate. The office must be spiritual and not secular. The institution must return to its primitive idea.

"In proceeding to the election of a bishop," says Prof. V. Schulte, "we need to be first of all fully clear in regard to what his relation is to be to our congregations, what power, what rights he is to possess. For this, we cannot just refer to the body of canon law and later papal bulls. The bishop must stand to us in the relation demanded by the true conception of the Christian Church. He must be a father, a shepherd ; not a prince ruling us by vicariate orders with legal frigidity and unloving soul, but a father speaking the language of the heart and of Christian love."

Prof. Michelis, on the same subject, rises into a sort of prophetic exaltation, as if he felt the choice of a bishop to be after all but a secondary circumstance in the moral grandeur of the general movement in which it was to find its place.

"I am opposed," he says, "to fixing a time for the election of a bishop, on the principle that the basis of our whole movement, that which makes my participation in it a matter of conscience, holds for me in the conception of actual exigency and need. My inward confidence in the Catholic Church and her truth, has not suffered, from all we have passed through, so much as the very slightest change. I am often looked upon as an idealist. I have indeed always viewed the matter in theory, as it has now become for me practical also by the infallibility decree. The truth of the Church has been for me independent always of the miserability of circumstances and men. That this miserability meets me at present in a degree, which in former times might perhaps have crushed me dead, I am ready to allow; but it cannot do that now. Not a particle of my Catholic conviction has yet been disturbed; and just this conviction it was, this Catholic conscience, that led me, without complaint, as soon as the decision of Rome took place, openly to declare in the clearest and most distinct terms my determination, to stand up for the truth of the Church against this frightful perversion. That is my principle and rule; to follow the conduct of necessity, and not to run ahead of it. So we have done the last year in the matter of congregations; and I believe our cause to be so much farther advanced at present, that the restoration of the episcopal office is becoming for us now also a similar need. But it is not such as calls for action just at once. And I know not if the right time may be for it within three months or six, or even within the term of a year. At this moment we stand before an extraordinary crisis. I believe—it is only my personal conviction indeed, but every one has to govern himself by that—I believe that the course of our whole cause, as things are now around us, is going to be altogether extraordinary. As I view the case, we have come to a crisis, a grand interior point of decision in the history of humanity, in world-history, such as has not had place probably since the birth of Christ, certainly not since the commencement of the Middle Ages. And I may be allowed, I trust, without offence, to give utterance to the uplifting thought; yes, we have felt it, how in a truly marvellous manner a higher hand moves in the history of the world. For me it is no chance, that the declaration of infallibility falls in with the conflict of Germany for her true existence We see thus the relations of the time gathering themselves under our eyes into a crisis, which of itself makes it impossible that our cause, as some have feared, should run itself out in the sand. I have myself had no such fear, not even for a moment. Can we then be so weak as to grow faint and weary, when we are not met at once with full success? We are on the eve, I repeat, of a grand crisis. Let us commit ourselves to the course of events. Possibly in a few months the choice of a bishop may become a necessity. Thanks to the services of the Archbishop of Utrecht, it is not that now. How soon it may come to be so depends on circumstances in the future. A premature choice, a choice made without absolute need, would be a hindrance for the work we have in hand rather than a help. We *might*, by God's grace, get a man who would be wholly after God's heart. But who is to go bail for that? It is quite as possible for us to make a mistake, and so damage heavily our own cause. It is in this way a dangerous experiment. With me, the one simple maxim of necessity is decisive; when it is absolutely a need, let the choice take place, but not sooner. My own confidence in the progress and success of our movement rests on the unshaken trust I have in the divine conduct of world-history, in the Church of Jesus Christ, and in the moral force we are bringing to bear on this conflict. But this moral force consists not at all in our having just at once a bishop, but in this rather: that with our small resources, in the heavy pressure that is now upon us, we hold out and yield not; working on in the narrow, small sphere in which we have worked thus far, with unwearied holy zeal and patience. In patience lies our strength and salvation; but the immediate choice of a bishop would seem to proceed rather from impatience, and therefore I like it not."

To some the language of Professor Michelis in regard to the world-historical momentousness of the work in which the Old Catholics are engaged may sound extravagant. But it will not seem so to those, who, looking to ideas more than to outward appearances, have taken pains to study the work in its own character, and in the light of the relations with which it is surrounded.

It is not of an accidental or sporadic nature in the progress of the world's general life. It belongs to the central stream of this life as it comes before us in Christianity; and is here in the direct historical line of what has been for centuries the grand ruling question of the Christian Church, the problem of church reform having for its object the rectification of the disorders and miseries of the Church. It is a pitiful view of the case, which makes it to be a protest simply against the definition of the Pope's infallibility on the 18th of July, 1870, without regard to other previously existing vast abuses in the Roman Church. This is regarded only as the culmination of a system which had been at work long before, but only came now at last to the point of direct open antagonism to the whole idea of Christianity, making it necessary for the Christian conscience to save itself by equally open and full revolt. This is what is so well shown by Professor Reinkens in his popular tract *Conscience and the Vatican.* The system in question is the so-called Papal System, which grew up in the Middle Ages, basing its pretensions on notoriously false historical premises; which sundered the Western or Latin Church from the Eastern or Greek Church; which affected to comprehend in itself all powers both civil and ecclesiastical; which drew after it sore disorders and manifold abuses in the Christian world, palpable to all men; which stoutly fought off all attempts toward inward reformation, and so forced upon Europe the violent outward Protestant breach of the 16th century; which gave birth to the Society of the Jesuits, and, which has now at last yielded itself fully to their power, in what must be considered a monstrous crusade against the political freedom and the universal intelligence of the modern Christian world. The Old Catholic movement is directed against what it assumes to be the tyranny and wrong of this Papal System, exercised through ages in such vast style and now brought to its full climax in the late Vatican decree. In this view the movement is itself but the historical continuation of that opposite power in the Church, which has been all along active for its redemption from what Luther has called its Babylonish captivity, the dominion of the Papacy; though never as yet with any proper success. What the reformers before the reformation labored for; what the great councils of the 15th century struggled in vain to reach; what Protestantism in its different way undertook to bring to pass in the century following, with as yet also only most imperfect success; namely, deliverance of the Catholic Church from the yoke of the Papacy, without harm to the true original life of the Church, and the re-constitution of Christianity, thus, under a form making it possible to bring its most melancholy divisions to an end; this old endeavor, the burden of the world's history for so long a time, is the same work which has now come also into the hands of these Old Catholics, and which they feel themselves commissioned of God to conduct to its triumphant end at last in a way answerable to the antichristian climax that has been reached on the other side. And if this be so, who will say that their position is not one of solemn grandeur, or that it may not have to do indeed with a crisis equal to any that has been known since the time of Christ?

The tremendous nature of the general issue which runs through this conflict of ages, and which has now come to such a final life and death struggle as never before, we have already seen. It turns on what is for men the fundamental problem of their existence, the right practical adjustment of its individual and general sides, the principle of freedom in one direction and the principle of authority in another. We are not of those, it is well known, who worship the idea of individual liberty blindly, and see all danger for life only in the idea of outward authority and power. Freedom centering in mere selfhood, we well understand, is not true freedom, but false licentious freedom; and by that sin the angels fell. For years we have been doing battle, from pulpit, rostrum and press, with the popular idols of private judgment and private will, and insisting on the divine right of objective government and law, against the different radical and revolutionary tendencies of the age. These tendencies are indeed dangerous, and threaten to sweep all political and religious interests into chaos. We need the true idea and power of the state, and still more the true idea and power of the church, to hold them in conservative restraint; and just here it is, that the Roman theory finds, for minds in a certain state its most plausible argument and its most seductive attraction. But the abuse of freedom is no reason for the destruction of freedom; and if the individual and simply subjective side of our life, thrown upon itself, tends only to evil, it is no less certain that its general and objective side, taken in the same separate way, tends also only to evil. In other words, authority is just as liable to be abused, and made ruinous to the welfare of men, as freedom. As there is a false freedom, so also is there a false authority; and a right regard to the great interests of humanity and religion requires that the one should be withstood just as much as the other.

When is it now, and how is it, that authority, being as it is of indispensable necessity for all our human life is liable to become thus false and wrong? We answer: Whenever it is dissociated from freedom, and made to stand toward men in a simply outward and mechanical relation. Authority and freedom are opposite, but not therefore contradictory conceptions; their opposition is polar; antithetic in order that it may become synthetic. Our human life includes in it both terms, in such sort that each is required to be the complement and perfection of the other. This cannot be by any outward conjunction or juxtaposition, but only through inward concretion. If the one is not thus concretely and livingly in the other, their relation ceases to be normal; and both become in fact mere formal abstractions, void of their own proper sense and power.

All dominion, power and authority among men are legitimate thus, only as they are found to be in order to personal freedom among men. This does not mean, of course, that human subjects are not to be in any case bound and coerced to what is right, beyond the free consent of their own judgment and will. Authority involves discipline (the sacrament of the rod), and freedom rests largely in the obedience of faith. But everywhere, and always, the power that is exercised over the children of men, if it is to be of a right character, must have for its object the training of its subjects to the highest ends of their existence, *through* the development in themselves of the spiritual and moral capacity which God has given them for this purpose.

The power of parents over their children in this way, is for the emancipation of the children in the end; as their true freedom can come effectually also only through their obedience to the power exercised over them thus for their good. Suppose in the case, however, a mere outside rule on the one side, and a mere blind automatic submission on the other, and who does not see that the family must be for those in its bosom a ministration of death rather than a ministration of life?

What is true thus of all family government is no less true of all political government. The state is an essential mode or form of human existence, in which sovereignty is required to be exercised for the object of making all who are under it participant alike (according to their measure) of the political life belonging to the state as a whole.

And so it would seem it ought to be also with the authority of religion, especially with the authority of the Christian religion, and with the powers of the Christian church (the highest of all institutions ordained of God for making men complete in their existence), as related to the object of human culture in its universal view. Christianity, in the New Testament, claims to be in this way a principle of freedom and true humanization for men, beyond all the world had ever known before. Even the Old Testament, with all its externality, is a law of liberty and light, a discipline unto inward righteousness; but how much more the New Testament. Here especially it is the *entrance* of God's word into the soul, that giveth understanding and makes the soul interiorly strong and free. Christ's words are "spirit and life." To follow Him, is not to walk in darkness, but to have the light of life. In so doing, it is said, "ye shall *know* the truth, and the truth shall make you *free;*" this being the office and work of truth, and so also the only true idea of religion, that it should illuminate the understanding and inform or energize the will.

Or take the subject in a still higher view. We are taught by our Lord to pray: "Thy will be done in earth, *as it is in heaven.*" The highest conception of religion is, then, that it should be among men here below, what it is in the other world among the angels. But how is it now that the angels do the will of God? Not in any way, most certainly, of following simply their own private judgment or impulse. Their service is bound by law; the will of God is for them an authority or rule coming from beyond themselves, just as really as it is this for the stars and planets in their courses. Of angels and stars alike it may be said: "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is *settled in heaven.* They continue this day according to Thine ordinances; for all are Thy servants." More than this; as the stars and planets are joined together in systems, *through* which then the law of nature takes effect upon them severally, so are the angels also joined together in hierarchies or heavenly polities, which mediate for them in the same way the word or law of God in its spiritual form. There are for angels thus, no less than for men here on earth, principalities and powers ordained of God for the use of general societies; which are for these societies, then, ministries and vicegerencies of God, channels of His grace, personal bearers and organs of His will; whom the societies, otherwise considered, are bound to honor and obey, as planets do homage to their central suns. So far the idea of objectivity reaches for the angelic life; but no farther. It does not turn the angels into dead nature forces, into winds, or flames of fire, or shining planetary orbs. They are not, even over against God Himself, and still less over against those who exercise authority upon them in God's name, mere passive organs of the Divine will, moving only as they are moved from beyond themselves; as a staff is moved, for example, by the hand of him who carries it, or a corpse by those who undertake to dress it for the grave. No; the angels have their own intelligence; their own will; their own self-moving life and action. All this in such sort, however, that their selfhood is as it were continually sunk in God, and devoted in spontaneous service to the well-being of the society of which they are a part. They *will* to do the will of God, and in their freedom cannot choose to do otherwise. The law they obey as from beyond themselves, is at the same time wholly in themselves. Authority and freedom are with them absolutely one; their law and their liberty each in the other; the liberty having in the law its necessary matter or substance, and the law finding in the liberty its no less necessary form. As if the planets, now held blindly to their course, were made to have in them the light of inward intelligence, and with it the power of independent motion, to go where they might please, and should yet now of their own sweet pleasure move onward still as before, "forever singing, as they shine, the hand that made us is divine." So the angels do indeed, in their higher and more glorious heaven, show forth continually the praise of God, standing in His presence and swift to do His will. And this, we say, is the only true ideal, to be looked to and reached after in the culture of our human life, and most of all in this culture as it is required to go forward in the church. It must aim at least to bring those who are the subjects of it, to do the will of God on earth as it is done by the angels in heaven. It must be in order to freedom and truth in the inward parts. All its authorities, agencies and ministries must have this for their design and scope. Otherwise they cease to be true to the idea of religion, and are found thus false at once both to God and man.

But the Roman theory of Christianity and the Church, which after a thousand years has issued at last in the full-blown Jesuitic doctrine of the late Vatican Council, stands as we have already seen in world-startling contrast with all this. It goes on the assumption that a free subjectivity on the part of men, and an effectual objectivity on the part of God, are incompatible terms; and that to avoid the manifest bad possibilities of the first, there is but one alternative; namely, such an outward enthronement of the second over all the spheres of our human existence as shall reduce them to a state of mere automatic dependence on this external sovereignty. For the licentiousness of freedom we have substituted thus the licentiousness of power; the false absolutism of Hobbes, in the political order, for the false liberalism of Rousseau. As a theory of God's general relation to the world, it is deism in its difference from theism; such a view of God, as excludes Him in fact from all real immanence in the life of the world (physical or moral), and exaggerates in such sort the idea of His transcendence, that He is regarded as standing on the outside of it, and working it after His own plan in a purely mechanical way. The authority that binds, becomes in this way all in all; the existence and life which are bound, less than nothing. And so it is in the end that Christianity itself, the highest sense of humanity (if it be true), and the "perfect law of liberty," is turned into a tremendous law of servility, a sirocco blast from the desert, before which the fairest fruits of humanity are struck with the blight of universal desolation.

We mean no polemical rhetoric or rant, in what we say; and God forbid that we should trifle with the subject irreverently in any way; for it is altogether too solemn for that. Our object here is mainly description only, and not argument; the description being left then to speak for itself.

Is not this system in truth the hard military rule of Ignatius Loyola and the Society of the Jesuits, made now after three hundred years to be the soul of the Papal Church? Does it not hinge throughout on the principle of blind obedience to external authority, blindly accepted as the organ of God in the same outward view? Does it not demand, Moloch like, the immolation of the understanding, the immolation of the will, the slaughter in one word of all spiritual and moral independence, onthe part of those who commit themselves to its grim embrace, in order to make sure, in this frightful way, of their own eternal salvation? And is it not then a necessary result of all this, that the entire authority of God in the Christian Church, thus outwardly apprehended, should be taken to lodge itself ultimately in the single person of the Pope (the apex of the system); and that he should be declared infallible (regardless of all inward moral conditions, since all goes here by a sort of magical outward clock-work), so as to be for men the visible presence as it were, and actual speaking voice, of our Lord Jesus Christ on the earth? Then all other bishops and priests, belonging to the system, are simply puppets in the Pope's hand; he becomes himself in fact the entire hierarchy. And as Louis XIV. dared to say of France, *I am the State*, so Pius IX. then may say also, *I am the Church;* as he has in fact already allowed himself to say in a truly naive way, *I am the Church Tradition!* But who cannot see, how this does away completely with St. Paul's view of what the Church is as the Body of Christ? A body is a living organism, having its life and activity inwardly, not in its head only (much less in a wooden figure of its head), but in all its parts; just what this Papal system is in no way willing to allow.

And if there may be with it no free organic life in the ecclesiastical order, how should it be tolerated with patience in the civil and political order? Let the constitution of Boniface VIII., the badly famous *Unam Sanctam*, with its doctrine of the two swords, give answer. This medieval document is now re-enacted in the broad-daylight of the 19th century, and is a blow struck in fact at the political independence of all nations. Cardinal Antonelli tells the nations indeed, that it is not to be taken in full earnest; but it goes with the system, necessarily, and cannot fail to pass now from theory into practice (as it is already doing in Germany and other countries), with consequences which God only can foresee; consequences, of which the German bishops gave solemn warning in the Vatican Council, although they are now themselves doing all they can to precipitate them, if need be in civil war, upon their native land.

From such outward mechanical domination over individual consciences, and over the independence of families and statesa it is but an easy and necessary step onward to the claim of a like outward domination over all human culture, all science and, art, all education, all the higher interests of the world's natural life, regarded as having in them any reason or right to be at all, outside of the vast strait jacket of authority prescribed for them by the unenlightened mind of the Pope. That is the sense of the *Syllabus*. Even history, as a science, must adjust itself to this Procrustean bed. Döllinger, one of the greatest masters of history, challenges the attention of the Archbishop of Munich to facts, which if established should blow the decree of the Pope's infallibility to atoms. The only answer deigned him, is excommunication. Professor Schulte, another such master, tries to get attention also to an overwhelming array of historical testimony; but he too is met only with a curse, the last argument, and here the only one, of those who, in their fond spiritual autocracy, feel themselves to be *kings*. "The church," we are told, " must control the decisions of the historian" (and why not then the decisions of the astronomer also as in the case of Copernicus and Galileo); " all history and all science must be studied from the central point of the papacy."*

What I have now brought into view, may serve to show the broad and profound meaning of the issue which is involved in the Old Catholic Movement. The question with which it is concerned has been at work for centuries, but never before under the same radical and urgent character as now. Around it are gathering more and more, whether with full consciousness or not, all the deeper forces of the world's life at this time; and it has now come to such a form, that it is hard to see how a full answer to it can any longer be delayed. That the world altogether is in the midst of a crisis of the most extraordinary sort is becoming continually more plain. Never was a great epoch heralded, not simply for the thought, but also for the very feeling of men, by a more impressive array of prophetic and admonitory signs. The concurrence of outward and inward forces, flowing together from different sides, in the age of the Reformation, was less striking. The only parallel to it is in what had place at the coming of Christ into the world; and it is not strange that some have been prompted to see in it, in this way, the actual counterpart of that first advent, the introduction of a new dispensation in fact, drawing with it in the end the full power and glory of His second advent.

"We are now plainly enough," says I. H. Fichte† "placed in a transition state, where slowly but irevocably an era of a thousand year's duration is sinking into ruin, while the new world that is to rise out of the ashes of the old is hardly discernible as yet even in its rudimentary outline; directly around us threatening chaos, before us the heavy cloud of a still impenetrable future!" This was spoken nearly a quarter of a century ago, in view of the surging moral and political forces, revolutionary and reactionary, which were then at work among the nations of Europe. But who may not see with what accumulated sense it applies to the state of Europe and the world at the present time? Whenever before did a period of like brief duration precipitate upon the world's experience, such a succession of vast and mighty changes, as have gone forward, on both sides of the Atlantic, within the past twenty-two or three years? And who with the least faith in God can help seeing and feeling that these changes carry in them in some way the power of a common world-historical sense, and are conspiring rapidly toward a common world-historical purpose and end?

---

* Are we to take it as a bold example of what an infallible Pope may dare to do in this way, or must it be taken for an unconscious self-ironizing *bull* of the Irish sort, that in the Vatican decree of Papal *Infallibility*, a mutilated utterance of Gregory the Great is gravely quoted so as to give a sense just the contrary of its rea] meaning, and the opposite of what all the learned world knows to have been the mind of that great and good man?

† System der Ethik. Erster kritischer Theil. 1850.

In the bosom of this universal crisis of the age it is, that the significance of the Old Catholic idea, the rehabilitation of the Catholic Church in its pristine character and form through an act of self-awakening from the thousand years' incubus of the Papacy—comes fairly into view. Looked at ideally and theoretically in this way, the movement is worthy of profound attention, and must be allowed to take its place among the higher apocalyptic signs and wonders of the age, even if practically for the time it should come to naught, or pass ultimately along with other movements into the service of some deeper and broader tide of reformation not yet in the thought of its present martyrs and confessors. The simple fact that it has made its appearance in Germany, after the Franco-Prussian war and cotemporaneously with the resurrection of the German Empire, on the heels of the Vatican Council and the downfall of the Pope's temporal power, is enough to invest it for the thoughtful student of the times, with more than an accidental character and more than a transient interest. For it is not easy to feel, that Germany is not now destined, even more than in the 16th century, to lead the way in any great spiritual revolution having to do with the religion and civilization of the Christian world.

It tells in favor of the cause again, that it is calling forth angry persecution on the part of its enemies, while it is characterized on its own side only by meekness, patience, sacrifice and persevering self-denial. The recreant bishops, with their army of vassal priests, have spared no pains to inflame the minds of an ignorant and superstitious laity, wherever it was possible, against the movement. Newspapers and tracts are at work, as well as pulpits, dealing out the most scurrilous abuse. Societies and public meetings are brought into requisition for the same purpose; and it is wonderful with what masterly effect. For although the Jesuits are gone, their educational drill is in full play. As an example, take the following graphic picture of the state of things in one region (the district of Münster), from the correspondence of the *Deutscher Merkur*, 23 Nov. 1862.

"Allow me," the writer says, "to describe our circumstances in a religious and political view, as not without much that deserves notice. The people here have been for centuries quietly disposed, under different forms of government, being of rather sluggish spirit, and without any turn for politics. They are nearly all Catholics. The clergy formed under the mild views of such men as Overberg, Kistermacher, Katerkamp, and Kellermann, were plain, simple, good-hearted. One scarcely noticed, when the body began to change gradually by the introduction of new men trained under wholly different influences. The Jesuits themselves, till quite recently, observed moderation. So came on the years 1869 and 1870. When Prince Hohenlohe for a political purpose brought up the question of infallibility, it awakened here only displeasure; it was viewed as an offence toward the Catholic Church, to take the thing as in earnest. So when the *Civilta Cattolica* came out with its well-known article on the subject, everybody was angry, and pronounced it craziness. As, however, the matter grew more serious, the clergy declared almost with one voice, that it was impossible the infallibility of the Pope could be decreed. And now? They have all submitted. Not a man of them resists; while many have grown fanatical, and drag the people along with them. The pulpit, the confessional, and private talk, were made use of to introduce the dogma. The women were worked upon, and these drew the men with them, or forced them to submit. When the major part was won, recourse was had to stringency; the refractory were refused absolution; the faithful were stirred up against them and made to threaten them with loss in their worldly business. So things have come to their present pass. Nobility and clergy work in common for the absolute power of the Pope with great zeal. In the quickest possible succession missions have been held in the towns and villages to gain over the people; being forbidden to the Jesuits, they are carried on by the Redemptorists now under other names. Numerous associations have been formed, which stand under the immediate direction of the priests, young men's sodalities, brotherhoods, Catholic unions of all sorts, and no pains are spared to swell their membership to the utmost. These are called upon for public demonstrations; pilgrimages; torch-light processions; to found new associations, put down obnoxious journals, to help spread their own party sheets, to promote ultramontane views, or gather subscriptions to addresses; and all such calls they must unconditionally obey.—Looking at the different classes of society, we find the ultramontane interest followed by the entire nobility, by nearly all the office-holders as far as they are Catholics, and by the majority of those who live in the towns and villages; a part knowing better, but keeping their mind cautiously to themselves. The country people are protected in some degree against the course of things by their plain natural sense and their attachment to past custom; hence farmers' unions, headed by nobles, are now actively employed to bring them into the traces.—The schools are in the hands of the Vatican party, and exercise of course a vast influence. Everywhere the Catechism of Overberg is in use; which all along has had in it the question: "Is the infallibility of the Pope an article of faith?" followed with the answer: "No; it is no article of faith." Now, however, new leaves have been printed, making the answer just the other way, *Yes;* and all the Catechisms having been called in, the old leaf in every copy has been torn out and a new one put in its place. Thus the new doctrine was brought in, and wo to him who should now sell a Catechism with the old leaf. Only the excessive veneration in which the clergy are held in Münster territory could allow such a proceeding to pass without opposition. In this veneration the women go farthest, exalting particular priests at times into objects of fanatical devotion. These have then of course an almost boundless influence. All pains are taken to carry this man-worship to its highest pitch in favor of the person of the Pope. Devotion to him, entire self-immersion in his thought and will in genuine Jesuit spirit, is made to be the highest perfection ; and so then, hate, curse, and persecution to any one who may in word or act oppose so holy a man. All manner of superstitious observances and fancies come in to help this malign humor; and as the greatest foe of the new tendency is the German Empire, this is especially abhorred, and a fond eye turned toward France. This can be felt in the tone of the party sheets, as it is shown also by the avoidance of patriotic festivals and in other ways.—To the great mass-pilgrimages, which were set on foot by the priests during the latter part of the summer, with the utmost possible show, in almost all places, as demonstrations against the German Government, are added now conventions of Catholic Unions, which count by the thousand and more, and aim at a consolidation with the immense Catholic Association of Mentz. The speakers openly threaten a mobilization against Bismarck. Such mass meetings have been held in Borken and Ahaus, and another is soon to come off in Coesfeld.—Altogether the results of the later clerical system in Münster territory may well give rise to concern. The blind subjection of the lower clergy to the bishop deprives them of all legal independence. By the Vatican decree the bishops are subjected to the Pope, and together with their clergy are but organs of his will whom the people must follow blindly. The Church, now ruled exclusively by the Pope, takes hold on all the relations of life, and so we have a double kingdom. Here that of the Pope and his organs—the clergy and clerical associations; there the State, with its officers and its army. The Pope claims unconditional supremacy; the State unlimited control in secular affairs. But as both assert their dominion over the same subjects, and both are bent on using their power to the utmost, the result must be a conflict, which can end only with the sore defeat of one side or the other. The body of the people stand before this danger without knowing what it means; urged on all the time by their clerical leaders, and maddened through what they take to be persecution of the Church into ever greater hatred of the powers of the State. And as it is in Münster, so is it also in every region with a prevailing Catholic population. It is unmistakable that wires extend from France to Rome, and from Rome to Germany. Both France and Rome wish to reign; they join hands that each may gain its end. France, for revenge, and Rome, for the spiritual mastery of the world, are ready to commit themselves if need be, to the violence of open war. What that would mean for the ultramontane party in Germany, in the way of calamity and sorrow, is very easy to calculate, when we consider the sound and resolute spirit of the German people as a whole, and their actual preparation to put down any hostile agitation when it once comes to acts and blows. On the Jesuits and their servile 'German Bishops,' more than on the Pope, rests the terrible responsibility of the case before the bar of God and of history."

An outrageous display of the rising temper here brought into view occurred on the 23d of December last, at Lippstadt in Westphalia, where Prof. Michelis had gone by special invitation, to address a meeting of Old Catholics. As he was on a visit to a friend in the afternoon, a mob of more than a thousand of the Pope's friends, "persecuted Catholics" as they call themselves, gathered whistling and shouting in front of the house, and crying out against the "heretic." Undertaking to return to his hotel, he was set upon with stones (just four days before the festival of St. Stephen!) one of which struck him on the head; and the ordinary police proving unequal to the occasion, a company of soldiers had to be called in to disperse the crowd—the result being, several of the rioters wounded, and four of the ringleaders put under lock and key. To such bigoted madness has it come with the papal party; and leading newspapers of the party only regret openly, that the penalty of the disorder should not have fallen in this case on the really responsible cause of it, Prof. Michelis and the Old Catholics who invited him to Lippstadt!

The outlook of things in Germany at this time, it must be confessed, is exceedingly solemn. There is an ominous sultry feeling in the air, boding no one can say what tempests and storms. Listen to the following passage from a Prussian jurist: "The rabid spirit of the common people makes the danger for the State in the highest degree pressing and serious. If the controversy were between the educated, between parties as they commonly are, while the great body of the population continued in true reverence for the secular order, single laws and ordinances might be enough; but it is the millions of which the opposition boasts, who are to be taken into account here, and whose violent onset is to be withstood. And verily, it is no mere blind onset of the masses. The clergy have been for years organizing with the utmost prudence and foresight; they are ready; they can handle the masses with the greatest ease, just as they wish. The enemy of the empire is in the heart of Germany; his league with outside hostile powers is beyond question. Depend not on the supposed reigning culture. The present mingling of religion and the lust of power is well adapted to produce the wildest fanaticism, capable of developing a force and calling forth a destruction, that would soon turn your complacency into terror. You hold the number of the deluded to be small? you think you have the cultivated on your side, and make calculations which leave the enemy but little force? You are deceived! Cast your eyes over the land. In congregations of 5000 souls there are not 5, who would dare to withdraw themselves from clerical direction. Visit the mass meetings, and learn the number and strength of their attendance. Hearken to the abuse of the government, the scorn thrown upon the hated German Empire, and notice the applause with which it is received by the mighty crowds of people. The danger of the return of the Thirty Years' War presses continually nearer; all the distraction and hopless misery of those terrible days threaten to come again on our fatherland."

The question of what the State should do, or refrain from doing, in such a trial as that to which the German Empire has now come, in its relations with the Vatican or Jesuitic Church, is of course one of great difficulty; and we pretend not here to go at all into its consideration. In any view, however, it must be carefully distinguished from the issue between the Old Catholics and this Church. The ground was taken in Cologne, that the only true succession of the Catholic Church in Germany is with the Old Catholics, that they have therefore a right politically to be so regarded and treated by the State, and that it is a self-stultifying and suicidal policy for the State *not* at once to acknowledge them in this character. But with all this, they hold themselves, in a way that is wonderful for Europe, rigorously aloof from all merely civil and political agitation. Their movement is no card, for government ends, in the hands of Bismarck or the German parliament. Their trust is not in politics in any way, but in the power wholly of moral and religious ideas, enforced by conscience and the Spirit of God.

On this subject we have a powerful address from Dr. Maassen, Professor of Law, in Vienna, in which he says that he had not been fully satisfied with one point made in the Munich platform of the previous year; this, namely, that "we reject the dogma of infallibility"—among other reasons—"because also it is dangerous to the State." Not that he questioned the truth so stated; for no one could be more fully convinced than he was, that the doctrine was in fact incompatible with the independent existence of the political order universally. But *that* was not properly a motive in this Old Catholic cause. For if the dogma were really from God, then it must be accepted even if the political order *had* to give way before it. The only justifying motive for this cause lay in the blasphemous untruth of the dogma itself. Others might reject it on political ground, or even as rationalists because of their holding no faith in the gospel at all. "But *we* for the gospel's sake refuse to own the infallibility of a mere man." Yet as Christians and Catholics, he goes on to say, "we are also citizens of the State, and have the same right and interest with others, to deprecate the bearing of the dogma in question on the common national life." Not even then, however, as if the question must be considered of life account for the Old Catholic cause in any way. A full outward adoption of that cause on the part of the State would seem indeed a vast gain; but it would involve also a vast peril. "Our future, our trust stands in the truth of our cause itself and in the firmness of our convictions and our faith." For the State, however, he adds, though not for their cause, "it is *eine Lebensfrage*"—a question literally of life and death. The truth of this proposition he then proceeds to make clear, and charges home upon the Prussian government particularly a weak and vacillating policy in the case, altogether unworthy of the world-momentous crisis.

"But be the course of things here what it may," he adds in conclusion, "our stand-point is not affected by it in the least. For us Pope and Bishops of the Vatican Church are no longer Pope and Bishops of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church at present has no Pope, and with only a few exceptions no Bishops. If a Council of orthodox Bishops could be convened (a thing just now impracticable), Pope Pius IX., and all the Bishops who have accepted the Vatican dogma, would be deposed from their offices and dignities. No such Council being possible, the necessity of the situation is for us equivalent to its judgment. This would be non-allowable only under two suppositions: first, a doubt as to the actual falsehood and heresy of the Vatican dogma; secondly, a doubt as to its actual and persistent acceptance by the Pope and his consenting Bishops. But both these points are clear, beyond all need of any judicial inquiry. Pope and Bishops are *ipso facto* thus deprived of their offices and powers. In what other view, could our present Congress take measures for choosing a new Bishop? For us it is a fixed fact, that Pius IX. is no more Pope of the Catholic Church, and that the Archbishops and Bishops who have bowed to the Vatican decree are no more Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church. This proposition is not uttered lightly; it is uttered by one who has looked toward these men with a sense of the most inward reverence, but who cannot yet shrink for a moment, where faith and conscience are concerned, from drawing the consequences on which only it is possible for faith and conscience to stand."

This address, we are told, was followed in the vast Gürzenich Hall with long-continued applause.

It remains yet to say something of the significance of the Old Catholic movement, as related to the subject of Church union. It is one of the observable peculiarities of the time, that the Christian consciousness under all forms (outside of the Vatican communion) is coming to be so much exercised with the thought that the existing divisions of the Christian world, back to the first grand rupture between the Oriental and the Western or Latin Churches, are something fatally wrong for Christianity, and that nothing is more necessary now than their removal to make room for its ultimate triumphs in the world. One may hear in this form as it were on all sides, "the voice of Him that crieth in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God;" and feel also how the glorious promise hangs upon it: "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." It is indeed a dreary desert that surrounds us now everywhere, through our reigning sect system (the bane of all the fruits of the Spirit as described in Gal. v. 22, 23); "a land where no water is;" a dry and thirsty land without dew, and where the heavens cease to drop down fatness. Who among us has not felt its blighting, narrowing, weakening, stunting influence upon our general spiritual life? And who that reflects can help seeing with Dr. Döllinger, that the divisions of the Church are the cause of all its other weakness, its loss of missionary power, its too generally pusillanimous, if not absolutely driveling attitude over against the inrolling tide of our modern skepticism and unbelief? What a thought that Christianity has conquered as yet no more than a third of the world's population; that Buddhism is both older and in numbers stronger; that Islamism, the paralysis of nations, is still going ahead of it in the work of new conversions; and that now when the highway of commerce and travel is opened for it into all the dark places of the earth, it has so little power to irradiate them with its own light? For, alas, our missions, whether Catholic or Protestant, are not taking any effectual hold upon the world's heathen life. They are at best but a sort of colonized Christianity, foreign establishments kept up within narrow limits through foreign supervision and help, without any true seat in the life of the people where they are; hybrid births we may call them in the bosom of that life, that belong to it after all only in an outward manner, and so have no capacity for propagating themselves (by a native ministry for example) in any truly independent way. And why is all this? There can be but one answer. It is owing to the fearfully dismembered state of the Christian Church. What hope can there be for any whole evangelization of India, for example, through a dozen different denominational agencies, practically opposing one another in their conceptions of what Christianity is, and each trying to draw converts to itself in the weak, piping voice of a miserable, separate, merely human sect? It is high time, surely, that the cry should be going up as it is now from the true heart of Christendom all over the world: "Return, O Lord, how long? And let it repent Thee concerning Thy servants. Restore Thou the captivity of Thy people. O satisfy us early with Thy mercy; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil."

This piercing cry of the soul for the reintegration of the Christian faith and life in a form answerable to the original idea of Christianity, the necessary condition (according to the word of Christ Himself) of its own soundness and of its power to conquer the world, becomes thus a measure and test by which we may try the spirit of all church constitutions at this time, so as to know whether they be of God truly or not. To be indifferent to what is so plainly now the inmost need of Christianity, or to be affected toward it in any way that is after all not really catholic or universal, but only sectarian and partial (the case with much of our popular declamation on the subject of church union), must be regarded in any case, as far as it goes, as an argument of defective church life, a presumption of questionable weakness with regard to all the main interests of this life; and so the opposite of such indifferent or superficial mind may be taken, in the case of any ecclesiastical cause, as the best proof of its being not of man but of God.

Applied to the Papal Church, this simple criterion is profoundly suggestive. That system has been notoriously the cause of the great division between the East and the West, through its tyrannical ambition and pride. It resisted all efforts made for the reform of the most crying abuses in the period before the Reformation; and so, in the sixteenth century, literally forced into existence that great Protestant secession, which has been the source of such endless division since. And through all this there has been no loving or yearning concern shown for a true inward healing of these sad breaches; but on the contrary a most unloving and stern intolerance of the very thought of union, except under the one condition of blind submission to a mere human autocracy, which contradicts the idea of Christianity, and which all history proves to have been unknown in the beginning. And now a new issue (the necessary logical end, however, of all going before) is joined with the universal conscience of the Christian world, driving it to the wall, and turning into derision, as it were, the whole thought of Christian union. Rome, of course, has in this *her* theory also of a world-reconciliation in the end. But it is most uncatholic. It is that of an artificial mechanical uniformity, without any sort of inward free organization, a dead monotonous reign of law over men without the spirit of life in them. To aim at unity in this way is a contradiction; to dream of reaching it, an absurdity. The policy of the Vatican is cold, and hard, and harsh; it is against union rather than for it; and it carries in it thus no power to conquer the world in the way of truth and righteousness.

"Our hope for the Old Catholic movement," says the earnest, whole-souled Dr. Reinkens, "rests first of all in the *hopelessness* of the Ultramontane Church. Nothing in the world that is no longer capable of development can stand. That is an unchangeable law: what is incapable of farther development must go down. The catholicity of the Church of Jesus Christ has four characters, like love; it has its height and its depth, its breadth and its length. Its height is its source in God; its depth is the mystery, that it coins the eternally one into an endless variety and fulness of glorious forms; its breadth is the expansive power it has to embrace all the nations of the earth in its band of love; and its length is the capacity of Christianity for development through all ages, and along with this its capability of appearing always in forms answerable to each stage of culture. But Ultramontanism has no catholicity; it is not Catholic, but Romish. It has, therefore, no height, for it springs from a few designing and ambitious men. It has no depth; for it sees unity only in superficial uniformity. It has no breadth; for it shrivels more and more together, has thrust off already half Christendom, is now causing new divisions, and will go on to shrivel till it vanishes from the earth. Finally, it has no length; for it can develop no farther, inasmuch as with the dogmas of the Pope's infallibility and autocracy, the system has got to its full end. The keenest wit of man is unable to see what more can come of it. That is God's judgment upon Ultramontanism; it must go down, because it has in it no power of farther evolution. And this is *our hope:* as Ultramontanism goes down, we grow; for out of its ruins rise the disenchanted nations, which will then embrace the truth and feel themselves happy with us."

Our Protestant sects, it is unnecessary to say, are also plainly unequal in their sect character to the task of restoring Christianity to its true form and power. With all the sense there may be among them of the wrong and misery of our Church divisions (and as already said, there is a great deal of that now in all directions), still it is not in their nature, *as sects*, to seek honestly an end of these divisions in the way of genuine catholicity; as they have not in them either *as sects* the power of doing anything effectual toward bringing such catholicity to pass. And the consequence of all this, as may be easily seen, is a growing impotency among them in their own abstract order of existence, each coming to be more and more the outward form and shell only of what it was in the beginning. Thus are they also judged of God and found wanting. But of this we will speak no farther at present.

Regarded from the point of observation here brought into view, the Old Catholic movement, it must be allowed, does carry in it, as Dr. Reinkens intimates, a bow of hope and promise for the world, that may well fix upon it the serious attention of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem. Even if it should come to nothing more, it has in it the force of a great lesson at least on the subject of Christian union, worthy of being studied and laid to heart by all parts of the Church.

It may be taken as God's signature upon the work, that it has been from the beginning not simply a protest against the tyranny of Rome, the great cause of the existing divisions of the Church, but an earnest overture, at the same time looking to the end of these divisions in the restored unity of the Church. That is felt to be the positive and full ultimate meaning of the movement, without which the merely negative oppositional side of it would be in truth of very small account.

So with Dr. Döllinger in his "Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches," which have found so favorable a response in Germany and also in other parts of the Christian world. In the same view again, we find the subject brought forward by Dr. Schulte, as already shown, in his address at the opening of the Cologne Congress; and it became part of the business of the Congress afterwards, as we know, to consider and act upon a report upon it, presented by a theological commission which had been previously appointed for the purpose. We can only look at the matter here in the most general way; our concern being mainly with the ruling principles and ideas, on which in the view of the Old Catholics this necessary side of the great Christian work in which they are engaged must go forward.

"In all efforts for the reunion of the Confessions," they say, "four things are to be eschewed as vain; unbelief, superstition, indifferentism and politics or state-craft. *Unbelief* has no hope, and where there is no hope there can be no Church. *Superstition* is darkness, and only the light that shineth into the darkness can give us a Church. *Indifferentism* is not, as so many affect to think, the strength of man, the free scientific man; it is spiritual debility and weakness; and only spirit and life can create a Church. *State-craft* belongs to another sphere wholly different from that of the Church, and when it seeks to use religion for its own ends, religion being itself the highest end of man, it is a crime against religion; no political diplomacy or chess-play in this form, therefore, can ever advance that well-being of mankind which is comprehended in the union of the Christian Confessions."

Such union, we are told, cannot consist in *uniformity.* National peculiarities, as they appear in different divisions of the Church, have their right, and are not to be suppressed. Hence unity cannot proceed from any single Confession imposing its will on others; it is possible only through the coming together of all. *Freedom* thus is the law here; not compulsion; not subjugation in any way. The union must be *historical;* based, as Dr. Döllinger says, on the Bible and the old œcumenical creeds; yet not so as to ignore the onward flow of the true Christian life in later times. Experience has shown, that as no true church union can come from statesmen and politicians, so neither can it come from ecclesiastics in their official character. Where hierarchies or ministries look upon themselves as the Church, separately from the body of the people, they are never free from the snare of ambition; and their official negotiations for unity, accordingly, are sure to run into an effort on each side to lord it in some way over the other. The union of the Confessions must come in the end from the hearts of God's believing children, brought to feel their common relationship in the family of God, and so refusing to remain any longer apart. The Old Catholics consider this to be the soul of their own movement, which is thus something wholly new in Church history. "Not in fifteen centuries, not since the beginning of the great divisions of Christendom, has there been anything like it in this, that not the rulers of the Church but the people should rise and say: We ask and demand the return of unity; there is awakening in us a longing for it, which we know to be from the motion of the Divine Spirit now abroad in the Church at large, and this motion we follow by trying to put ourselves at once in a position for the realization of what we desire."

True Church union, it is here assumed, must be catholic in its end, not partial or denominational, and can only come therefore from a catholic mind and purpose in the beginning—a spirit that seeks the reintegration of the divided Church in its *wholeness*, and not any alliance simply of kindred fractions of the Church, which may only serve after all to strengthen the main walls of division. Yet this is not so taken as to exclude the separate organization of collective national Churches. On the contrary, these are essential to the conception of Catholic unity; for nations are original and necessary diversifications of our general human life, resting on the basis of nature; and in any ultimate completeness of humanity (the true idea of the Holy Church Catholic—the Body of Christ), they must be, not abolished, but upheld and conserved as necessary component parts of this life. Such being the case it would seem indeed to follow that the cause of Christian union, as things now are, to be at all effectual, must aim first of all in any case at a national Church wholeness or catholicity, as the only way of reaching catholicity at last in its full œcumenical form. The Old Catholic movement accordingly, proceeds on this principle. While looking to a restitution of Christian unity in the world at large as its ultimate object, its immediate object is the restitution of unity at home, in the Christianity of Germany. Having made herself free from the bondage of the Papal system, the Catholic Church of Germany is to clear herself at the same time of the old disorders and abuses that have caused division heretofore, and so with the olive branch of peace in her hand say to the Protestant Church of Germany: Let our strife cease, and let us become one fold again under the one Shepherd Jesus Christ.

This is the idea that floats before the mind of Döllinger, and it made itself felt very sensibly in the Congress at Cologne. The English Bishops there showed at first some disposition to force into view their rather narrow theory of Anglicanism, as a model to be admired and followed in the proceedings of the body. But they were soon given kindly to understand, that the Old Catholics of Germany did not mean to become at once either Anglican or Oriental Episcopalians, and that they had no thought especially of looking upon German Protestantism around them in the Pharisaic style too often met with among the would be "Old Catholics" of England; and which, let us add, we find assumed at times with an air by the Episcopalian prudery of some also in this country. In the ideal resurrection Church of Germany, the vast spiritual wealth of the German Reformation is to be fully acknowledged and brought into use.

Such, we say, is the ideal of Döllinger and his friends. What may come of it practically hereafter, we presume not to forecast or predict. Neither do we pretend to criticise it here even as a theory or idea. Our business is to describe simply rather than review. It is not hard to see, however, that if the divisions of the Church in Germany could be healed in the way here proposed, and the now sundered Confessions were again reintegrated into a common grand National Church, in which the Old Catholic faith, redeemed from the long nightmare of the Papacy, should appear happily joined with what is right and good in Protestantism, it would go farther toward a resolution of the great question of the age than any other movement yet attempted or proposed for the purpose. Such a result reached in Germany would be like life from the dead, not only for that nation, but for the nations of Europe in general, and so in a very short time for the universal Christian world. It would be in this respect of infinitely more account than any

Pan-Episcopalian, Pan-Presbyterian, Pan-Methodist, Pan-Lutheran or Pan-Reformed mustering of ecclesiastical forces under their several distinguishing banners, without regard to nationality; and of infinitely more account also, of course, than all mere outside leagues or alliances, that have no higher idea of Christian union than that of a pacification of sects, coming to a general mutual hand-shaking, and agreeing to bear with one another kindly in their respective shibboleths and distinctions.

Looking at the Old Catholic movement in this way, we are not surprised to hear that it is in fact making itself felt already as a power of religious awakening outside of itself, beyond what might seem to be as yet the measure of its outward importance. "It must tell," says Bishop Strossmayer, "on the future religious life of Germany." The distinguished French theologian E. de Pressensè, speaking of the Cologne Congress says: "This convention will assuredly be remembered in Germany. Never since the Reformation were more weighty words spoken. Whatever may be thought of them, they form a page in history, and possibly *the preface to a large book.*" A prominent representative of the Protestant mediational school in Germany writes: "The days of Cologne are over! The power of the Highest wrought visibly in that Catholic conciliabulum. The perplexities of the older Church history are struck dumb before the dower of a new movement in the life of the Church. Old Catholicism, as a religious power, has made a step forward. And this without suffering itself to be drawn by the sapient state worshipers of our time into the attitude of a political party." Dr. Bluntschli, Privy Counsellor and Professor of Heidelberg, a no less prominent representative of the free-thinking wing of German Protestantism, declares: "What he had witnessed in the Cologne Congress convinced him, that there was no ground for apprehending that the Old Catholic Movement would lose itself in the sand; and that the movement has before it a great future." Still another leading Protestant voice says, with reference to the reunion question: "The difficulties of the case have not been overlooked; but the greatest thing by far is that a hand is actually put to the work. The Old Catholics have thereby shown themselves to be in the deepest conceivable sense German patriots and friends of the national peace. The common sympathy of the two Protestant Confessions with the movement, is working back also on their own relation to each other with salutary effect. Steady attention to what is here going on, and growing serious occupation with the problems and interests of Old Catholicism, have already begun to exert visibly an inward reconciling and uniting influence on the hostile parties of the Evangelical Church." One more testimony and we have done; a word this time from Italy, spoken by one of her best scholars, R. Bonghi, Professor in Rome. Called by his studies and position, he informs us, to observe closely the revelations that are taking place in the profound heaving and working of modern society, he has been led, in view of what official Romanism was on one side and the perpetual self-dissolving sect life of Protestantism on the other, to look upon the Old Catholic initiative as the last and only promise of help for the case. "If the reform of Catholicism succeeds not with you," he says, addressing the leaders of the movement, "if it succeeds not with you to restore a divinely accredited religious authority, free from all exaggeration, it will be in my judgment the greatest proof to show, that *Europe is on the eve of a religious overturning*, the end of which we can as little foresee as its mode of coming to pass."

ART. VI —DOES A DIVINE CURSE REST UPON THE WORLD?

This question admits of an easy answer to the believer in divine revelation. What we are there told is plain and unequivocal, and admits of but one interpretation. "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The New Testament also takes up the sad refrain, when it says: "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

And yet, although this is so plain that the Christian must believe it, it certainly cannot weaken our faith if we should find by an examination of nature, that the voice of the one agrees with the voice of the other. We propose to listen to this voice of nature in order to know whether it does not tell fundamentally the same story as the voice of revelation. We wish to examine the dicta of natural science, in order to see that the Scripture story of the curse is really true.

But, in order to do this, we will accept as true and indisputable, the conclusion which science has arrived at with regard to the creation, viz.: that it was not accomplished in six ordinary days of twenty-four hours, but that it progressed through long and indeterminable periods. Passing by the nicer points involved in this question, let us simply regard the days spoken of in the Scriptural story of the creation, as *days of God.* The Scriptures themselves seem to us to give sufficient indications of such days. "A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch of the night." "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

According to the Mosaic account of the Genesis, this latter was accomplished according to a law of progress—a lower stage of creation being always followed by a higher stage; in such a way, also, that the lower stage always looked forward to a higher one, of which it was always the platform. The first act was the creation of matter. We may suppose that at this stage, up to the time when the waters were gathered together and the dry land had appeared, the laws of mechanics and of chemical attraction and repulsion were in the hand of God the main forces of creation. When the dry land had appeared, the waters had been gathered together, and the firmament had been established, a great step forward had been made. Although the earth was yet desolate and barren, a desert waste, nevertheless, order had taken the place of the former chaos, and a point of departure had been gained for a new and higher order of creation, that of vegetation. This was in proper order followed by the creation of marine animals, land animals, and, finally, as the end and highest aim of all, the creation of man.

Such is the record of revelation. The record of geology is essentially the same. If the nebular hypothesis is true, then mechanical and chemical laws must at first have been the order of the day. After these had accomplished their object, and the earth had assumed the form of continents and oceans, the first geological age, just as in the Scriptures, is the Azoic. During this age no traces of life, either vegetable or animal, are found.

Next in order come plants. But as there is a constant onward progress in creation as a whole, so the same is very notable in every department of it. For plants first appear, not in their present perfection and beauty, but in the simple form of Algæ, or seaweeds. This order continues through all that geological age, which scientists have called the Silurian, and forward to the Hamilton period of the Devonian age. During the period named, evidences of land plants appear, and even of trees of the lower botanical orders. During the Carboniferous age, vegetation becomes very exuberant; but even here it continues to be of the lower orders, of ferns and kindred plants. After this, in the progress of the creative ages, come our present forest trees, and then fruit trees. But what seems to us very significant, is the fact that nowhere in the preadamite earth are there found any traces of fossil *cereals*, the *tame* plants, the proper food of man. These are found only where man has dwelt, as in the Swiss lake dwellings and in the pyramids of Egypt. May we not legitimately conclude from this, that they were the last vegetable creations of God? Intended for man, they made their appearance cotemporaneously with man.

If now we turn to animals, we find creation proceeding according to the same law of progress. During the Silurian age, fossils of only the lowest orders of animals are found, such as Molluscs, Articulates, and Radiates, animals like oysters, worms and crabs. During the following, or Devonian age, the first instance of the highest type of animal creation is met with in the form of fishes. Next in the order of time are found huge reptiles, the first of terrestrial animals, then mammals of colossal dimensions, and, finally, man himself. And what is here again remarkable, is the fact that those animals which were especially intended for the use of man, to be his companions and assistants, and to afford him food and clothing, are met with only in the age preceding the creation of man. Wild animals were being extirpated, and the so-called domestic animals were beginning to take their place.

From the scant traces which we have given, it will appear that creation proceeded according to a certain law, and in a fixed direction. The law was progress, the direction of this progress was *from the wild to the tame.* This seems to us to be a clear dictum of the geological record. During all the pre-adamite ages we find extinctions and creations; every extinction was followed by a creation, both vegetable and animal, which was higher and better than the preceding. May we not conclude from this that if some great disturbing element had not entered the world, reversing this law and its direction, an age would have come when nothing wild, nothing but what would have been of use to the physical, æsthetic, and moral nature of man, would have continued to exist? We do not mean to say that with the appearance of man everything that is wild had become extinct; we only mean that this was the direction of the law which governed the pre-adamite world, and that a time would have come in the history of the world, when every thing wild and of no use to man would have become extinct.

In what now did this curse, pronounced by God upon the world, consist? We suppose that it was, in the first place, a change or reversal in the plan of God. If we have rightly apprehended the law and direction of God in creation, it is no far-fetched hypothesis that the whole earth should at one time be a paradise, and that, at the creation of man, the earth was actually approaching this condition. The paradise which God created for the abode of man was limited to a certain area, the boundaries of which are distinctly given in the second chapter of Genesis. But it was the intention of God in the creation of man, that the latter should occupy the whole earth; for "God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." But if it was right and proper that a sinless Adam should dwell in a paradise, it is just as right and proper that a sinless Adamite race should also dwell there. The time would, therefore, necessarily come, when the limited area of the primitive paradise would require enlargement in order to accommodate the wants of the ever-increasing race. And, following this out to its last consequences, ought not the whole earth at last to be a paradise?

And this is no mere groundless speculation. We think that even natural science cannot deny the possibility of it. For climatic conditions, and, with them, the flora and fauna of the earth, and consequently, also, the adaptedness of the earth to be a pleasant abode for man, in fact, a paradise, depend very much upon its physical geography, upon the conformations of oceans, continents, and islands. It is known that the climatic conditions of the earth have often changed from these very causes. Suppose, now, that our arctic continents, those breeders of ice and winter storms, should sink beneath the ocean, a supposition which during the physical history of the earth seems to have been an accomplished fact more than once, what a wonderful change this would produce upon present climatic conditions. And suppose, further, that our continents were broken up into islands, giving room to the warm waters of the ocean to circulate freely, as the blood circulates in the human body and warms every part of it, can we not readily imagine that, wherever upon this earth there was solid land, there there would have been a paradise?

We suppose, in the second place, that this curse implies a retrograde movement to an antecedent stage of creation, a falling back upon a lower plane of the physical condition of the earth. Such was undoubtedly the effect of sin upon the physical and moral constitution of man. In a physical point of view, man was created mortal; or, let us say, he occupied a neutral position between death and immortality. The object of the trial in the Garden of Eden was to bring Adam out of this neutral position; to choose for himself either death or immortality. He chose the former. The possibility of dying, in which he was created, was given up in favor of the necessity of dying. The same was the case with Adam as a moral being. He was created innocent; that is, free from sin, but also without positive, acquired holiness. Another object of the trial in Eden was to give unto Adam the opportunity to choose freely between the two. He chose sin. From the possibility of sinning he passed over unto the necessity of sinning. From either point of view, the decision of Adam in Paradise was a retrograde, a fall to a lower position. We accordingly find, too, that his outward position in the world underwent a change corresponding with his inward condition. Before the fall it is said of Adam: "And the Lord God took the man and put him into the *garden* of Eden, to dress it and to keep it." After the fall it is said: "But Cain was a *tiller of the ground.*" The difference seems to us significant. Paradise was nature perfected and tamed; nature rescued from its extremes, and quieted down to its proper equilibrium; a picture and prophecy of that which, as the times and the necessities of the race demanded, the entire earth would have become. From horticulture man turned back to agriculture.

We suppose that this retrograde affected the climate of our planet, throwing it out of equilibrium which it had partly already gained, and to which the whole was approaching. It is certainly a remarkable fact that the earth in the course of its history had been subject to extremes of climate holding sway over entire ages. We find that first there was an age of excessive heat extending over the entire planet, as appears from the fact that fossil plants and animals are found in high northern latitudes, which at present are found only in tropical climates. This universal tropical climate passed away and was succeeded by an age of ice, which covered nearly the half of both the northern and southern hemisphere. Extremes ruled the earth for ages, and from one extreme it passed into the other. But in the course of ages both extremes were overcome, and a moderate and agreeable climate seems to have extended far towards our present arctic regions. This certainly appears from the fact that the mammoth and elephant, animals which at present are limited to warm southern climates, then roamed over the high northern latitudes of both the Eastern and Western continents. For even if these animals possessed a woolly covering, apparently to protect them against cold, yet if the regions over which they roamed were arctic as they now are they could not at any time of the year have found sufficient herbage to afford them sustenance. This suggests to us the same conclusion at which we have already arrived from the pre-adamite history of animals and plants. The prevailing character of the pre-adamite plants and animals was wildness. With the appearance of man those plants and animals appear, which were intended for his use and sustenance. So also the pre-adamite climate of the earth partook of the same character of wildness. It was excessive and extreme. An æon of cosmical summer, so excessive as to produce an excess of exuberant vegetation, was succeeded by an æon of cosmical winter, destructive of nearly all the life of the earth, both animal and vegetable. Both extremes passed away, and the climate was being tamed down to a moderate equilibrium. If the constitution of our globe embraces the condition of a universal summer extending through ages, and a universal winter extending through like ages, may it not also embrace the conditions of a universal medium climate; a climate best adapted to man, and to those animals and plants which are most adapted to his wants? And if the extremes of both heat and cold had actually passed away, and moderate climatic conditions were beginning to exist with the appearance of man; is it not probable that this last process of moderating and taming down would have continued, until the whole earth had become an abode calculated to educate man to his highest type, and to afford to him everywhere the highest enjoyment? Now the fact is, that present climatic conditions are not what they were in the age preceding the appearance of man upon the earth. The moderating process seems stopped; the genial medium has not been reached. The climate of the earth moves annually between extremes. Hence the earth is again better adapted to a wild vegetation and to wild animals. Weeds grow in exuberance, and our tame plants grow only when man bestows upon their cultivation the utmost skill and care. The earth does produce thorns and thistles more readily than grapes and figs; weeds more readily than corn and wheat And if man would eat his daily bread, he must do so in the sweat of his face, as the product of hard labor and toil.

ART. VII.—THE TENDENCY TO INDIVIDUALISM IN THE GERMAN CHURCHES IN AMERICA.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

The individual has intelligence and will, and must therefore have some degree of freedom in the exercise of his personal powers. Without such freedom there can be no personal responsibility, and, accordingly, no real manhood. Neither divine nor human law may ignore this fact, and turn man into a mere machine. It is the unalterable norm of moral order that individuality comes to its proper self-consciousness and personal dignity, in the way of unconstrained rational activity, a law which the new creation in Christ through the gospel recognizes, and towards the solution of which it is constantly tending. Indeed, there is nothing so grand and cheering in all history besides, as this process of evangelic individuation as it lies before us in the colossal movements of the Christian era.

Christianity has proven to be the most effectual destroyer of castes the world ever saw. Its ruling apostolic genius is in no sympathy with artificial barriers of any kind, standing in the way of the emancipation and unification of all classes and conditions of men. It places all on the same level before God in the economy of grace, and unites them into a brotherhood in which all distinctions prejudicial to manhood must give way. St. Paul says that in this communion there can be neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free, thus indicating the equality of all in the moral scheme of personality, giving to the world a new key to the laws of social and political economy, and opening the gates wide for the ushering in of an era of universal redemption, freedom and peace. We need not wonder that this trumpet-blast of apostolic good news met with a warm response from the popular heart all along the highway of Christian civilization, and that it gave rise to frequent antagonisms between the organized powers of society on the one hand, and the aspirations of individualism on the other. These struggles, or conflicts, were simply the conditions that lay directly in the life of the process to which they belonged, and hence in the very nature of things it could not be otherwise. Society, as the gospel found it, had no proper conception of the rights and dignity of the individual, and neither had the individual a true sense of his own responsibility and destiny, and of course the lofty ideal of a full-grown Christian community could only be gradually realized. But that this high standard has been approached by degrees, and that many of the beneficent results of the movement are now firmly imbedded in the laws and manners of modern society, is a fact too well known to require argument. The process has reached its present status in such a way as to leave the race in a much better state generally than it was when it began. The benefit is reaped by both society, in its universal capacity, and the indvidual personally taken. This is the secret that lies at the bottom of the momentum of our civilization, which, in the course of its progress, cannot be long resisted by any of the decaying systems of Pagan life.

Now it is not to be expected that so radical and far-reaching a revolution as this, involving such momentous issues, looking towards changes so intimately interwoven with the manifold interests of men and orders of society, and having such world-historical depth and significance, could be passed through without touching the tenderest chords of personal aspirations, thus giving rise to an order of intense individualism in the bosom of Christian nations. And if we consider that this vitalizing agency is present in history for ages, and that it is gathering strength as it is growing and spreading in the world, we may easily understand why there should be so broad and deep a chasm between the civilization, in the bosom of which Herod slew the young children of Bethlehem of Judea, without answering for his cruelty, and that of our own day and generation, in the codes and judicial proceedings of which so much care is taken that even the worst criminals receive the benefit of an impartial trial. This wide difference between the customs of antiquity and our modern humane modes of law and custom lies in the source from which it sprang, and in the life that gives it character and aim. Modern individualism, or individuation, would hardly differ from that of the ancients in principle, habit and spirit, had it not received its inspiritation in the schools of a more humane humanity than that of the classics, and had it not been ruled in all the stages of its growth by a more magnanimous tribunal than that of the forum. The presence of the kingdom of Christ in the world as the central power of history has brought about these wonderful miracles of change in the moral and social order of the nations, and therefore to understand the individualism of our civilization in its distinction from the economy of all other orders of life, ancient or modern, requires a philosophical sense of a positively Christian kind—a personality apprehended and borne along by the objective historic current, in the order of which the whole grand mystery of our civilization was begotten and brought forth.

But we must look now for some specimens by which the individualistic peculiarities of our times may be set forth, and the normal and beneficial, or abnormal and injurious, workings of the same may be demonstrated.

Individualism is not just the same among all people, even under the full power of the same order of life. Anglo-American individuality differs widely from that common to the Teutonic stock, although both stand in the bosom of the same nationality, and have a common destiny. Constitutionally they have much alike, belonging both to the Anglo-Saxon race, yet there are evidently very broad and radical differences between them. Americans of Anglican extraction are moving in the full tide of popular freedom and activity. In theory they often hold views which, followed out logically, would strike at the root of all authority standing over and above the individual, and those not familiar with their mode of reasoning by practical experience, would be liable to regard them as a body of fanatical destructives little better than the Jacobins and Red Republicans of French revolutionary memory. No greater mistake could, however, be made, generally speaking, in forming a judgment of the character and opinions of any people. Along with their extreme love of personal freedom, they possess a remarkable talent for organizing and co-operating in the enforcement of great and liberal measures, and a rigid practical conservatism by which they generally manage to maintain the supremacy of the laws and the stability of popular traditions, together with an apparently reckless disregard for fixed, routine, or stiff orthodox mannerism. Any one with his eyes but half open, may see this every day. By this ready adaptation to circumstances they atone for many of the theoretical heresies which characterize their modes of thinking. In Church government and theology, for instance, their views are often of the most bald spiritualistic and unhistorical kind; but when they come to take hold of the practical concerns of religion and the Church, they generally succeed to a wonderful degree in securing the co-operation of the masses, setting in motion thus an enginery of complicated ecclesiastical and beneficent propagandism not less effective, in its disciplinary movements, than many high-toned churchly organizations, or orders, of the same kind. Into these measures they frequently enter with an alacrity that cannot but be highly refreshing to all who have a taste for genuine business energy and zeal, and that especially in the cause of benevolent and religious enterprise It is this that has given them the power to found and endow so many institutions of learning, to raise up such magnificent monuments of public beneficence on a most munificent scale, and to carry forward schemes of missionary enterprise broad and comprehensive in character and aim, all by the powerful logic of generous co-operation. No blind or stupid fear of the possible abuse of organized effort, keeps them from banding together for the accomplishment of great ends. They are generally shrewd and intelligent enough to see that freedom of opinion is committing a grand folly when it refuses to join broad but liberal combinations, regardless of the necessary check thus laid on the selfish movings of individual caprice.

It is true, much of this Anglo-American munificence and success comes in large contributions, from the hands of wealthy individuals. Many of their literary endowments and benevolent institutions have been founded in this way, and yet it is well known that, in these cases of individual liberality, the masses are often asked to join; and they have frequently done so in a measure corresponding with the princely designs of the original movers. This is what has given Anglo-American life such aggressive force and prominence in all the public affairs of this nation. As matters now stand they have the advantage over all other nationalities here represented, but the time was when this was not so much the case, when other foreign elements were more on an equality with that of English origin and habits. But we have now a national character distinctly formed and drawn, and there is no longer any question as to what language shall be the vernacular of this great Republic. These things are strongly in favor of the English churches, and powerfully against those of other tongues. It has been so in the past, but it is becoming still more so every day; for the English language is rapidly sweeping every thing in its course, and no foreign tongue can maintain itself long except by immigration. In view of this fact it is but wisdom and good sense to submit cheerfully to the demands of the situation by cultivating and adopting the language and manners of the country, or make up one's mind to be absorbed peicemeal by the rapidly growing Anglo-American life around us.

And just here we may turn an eye to some of the peculiarities of Teutonic individualism, not only that we may look back to the past and know what has happened there, but rather that we may learn from the past how we may act wisely in the future.

That we who have sprung from the great Teutonic stock, whether we speak the language of Germania or not, are not as practical as our English neighbors, and that therefore we have not the same capacity for self-government, we take to be a self-evident fact that needs not to be repeated. This undoubtedly is our misfortune under the circumstances, although we may stoutly maintain that it does not amount to a reproach, since it is a constitutional failing over which nationalities have as little absolute control as individuals. However, if an honest confession is good for the soul, a little unprejudiced and intelligent examination into the short-comings of our native constitutional habit, may also leave a blessing in its track and bring us back to our task stronger and wiser, and better qualified, to act thereafter in accordance with the issues committed to our care.

Nothing have the German churches in this country so much reason to regret bitterly and profoundly, as their failure to take permanent possession of the commercial centres at an early day. They had an early foothold in many of them, but they let them slide from their grasp. This was not because they might not have held them, by the exercise of proper forethought and care; but rather because they did not comprehend the signs of the times, and did not satisfy the reasonable, the urgent, the irresistible demands of the rising wants of the American people. The young membership grew English, in spite of every obstacle or protest, no provision was made for them in the language they preferred, and hence they withdrew, either single file or in organized bodies, and passed into other connections. This process has been going on for generations, so that large numbers of the most intelligent and spirited members have gone away, and once flourishing churches stand almost forsaken or have disappeared altogether, except where foreign immigration has come to the rescue. Neither has this alienation or loss of material yet come to a close, but it is still going on precisely for the same reasons as before. This is the result of our Teutonic individualism, at least in a large measure, which has not been cured as yet entirely of its proverbial native helplessness. If the necessary foresight and capacity for prompt measures of relief were ever fully at its command, as we find them in the life and history of other ecclesiastical communions, we rather think this continual outflow of material from the German churches would long since have been checked or prevented, and we would stand foremost in many places where we have scarcely a name.

In our educational affairs we have also been sadly afflicted with a characteristic want of a practical matter-of-fact judgment, especially in the case of a higher culture. Some of our institutions of learning have an existence, dating back half or three quarters of a century. Even endowments of some kind were not altogether wanting at that early period, but, as far as the Reformed Church is concerned at least, they amounted to but little as sources for the general culture of our people, until the present generation began to turn them to some practical account. For this reason we failed to raise up a ministry competent to meet the growing wants of the more advanced classes, and hence we were brought to ecclesiastical grief especially in the commercial centres, and suffered immensely in the way of social caste and influence. All this did not happen because we might not have commanded the means to prevent it, but simply because as a body we had neither the will nor the practical capacity to rise up to the demands of the emergency. Had we consolidated our resources in an intelligent way, after the matter-of-fact style of the Anglo-American churches, we might long ago have maintained very respectable literary and theological institutions, and now we might proudly point to Anglo-German establishments of the kind which would rank among the broadest foundations of the country. What was the cause of all this?

It was not the want of intellectual calibre surely; for when it comes to the question of brains, the Germanic race may come in boldly for a comparative measurement of craniums.

And not only that, but they may point to their productiveness in many of the higher walks of intellectual culture—to their achievements in theology, philosophy, philology, and the fine arts, for instance, and justly claim that in the kind Providence of God they have been endowed with powers not inferior to those of the most gifted nationalities the world ever saw. But all this does not go to show now, that, with all their brains and noble qualities, they have not been and are not still seriously unequal to some of the practical issues of American history. Allowance must be made for circumstances and other considerations that cannot be mentioned here; but after all is said and done we will be forced back to the conclusion that Anglo-German culture, at the hands of the Germans in America, lags badly behind, simply because the Germans themselves, on account of their native individualistic helplessness, have not the practical energy to cope with the American mind in the broad educational movements of the day, at least as far as the founding of well-endowed centres of literary culture is concerned. When it comes to ideas and modes of thought, they stand not only on an equality with Anglo-Americans, but in some respects above them, and their institutions, though comparatively small, are the sources of the highest order of intellectual and moral culture, better suited to the wants of our people than the more empirical training of the reigning Anglo-American type. Ideas and modes of thought will however no more enable them to conquer the world extensively in the way of missionary growth and church extension, than similar gifts and powers saved the intellectual sons of Hellas from conquest and subjugation by the more practical and materialistic nationalities of the Latin race.

Now of course when we have pointed out the native weakness of the Teutonic character in the settlement of the question of language and the establishment of literary institutions, suited to the American situation, we have given the key to all correlative questions belonging to their history. All schemes for missionary and benevolent enterprise come in for settlement in the same way, and their want of satisfactory success must be accounted for on much the same principle. We therefore need not dwell on any facts of that kind with a view further to demonstrate the constitutional idiosyncracies of the Germanic stock, as differing from other leading nationalities. But there is one more feature of our subject to which we must make special reference, in order that we may bring out fully the justice of the train of thought we have been pursuing in this communication, and thus open the way for some practical conclusions to be drawn from it—we have reference to the undue fear of properly constituted authority in benevolent and church matters, which has entered so largely into our history, and which has been a barrier to our success at every turn.

We have frequently called attention to the want of Teutonic capacity for forming broad combinations for practical ends, and it is necessary here to say that, in this country where all measures of the kind must be of a voluntary character, this weakness was aided particularly in its pernicious tendencies by an exaggerated idea of personal freedom. It is a notorious fact that Teutonic individuality has been the prolific source of many a national disaster, simply because it ignored the higher claims of national unity. And if we look now into the history of the German Churches of America, it requires but little investigation to see that the want of organization, of unity, of a catholic co-operative denominational spirit, perhaps in the case of all of them, but especially with reference to the Reformed Church, was the main, the cardinal difficulty standing in the way of our progress, and doing incalculable injury to our standing and influence as an ecclesiastical power in the land. Not that others were not inclined in the same extreme way, but they were more successful in overcoming the mischief that sprang from this tendency. The sainted Schlatter made an attempt to effect a solid organization of our scattered Churches here, but he encountered this blind spirit of independency or exaggerated love of personal freedom, and he was driven into retirement before his noble work was accomplished. Subsequent attempts met with the same opposition, and now, only after ages of severe struggle, have we reached a tolerably compact order of Presbyterial government. Had we been as practical as the Puritans of New England, all our false notions of freedom on the one hand and of tyranny on the other, would not have done us so much harm ; but while they joined hands in a free but combined way to carry forward liberal measures, we stood pensive and alone in the bleak blue glory of our individualistic helplessness.

These are facts that will not very likely prove agreeable to our national vanity, and if it were possible to blot them from the records of our past experience, we should do so most cheerfully and readily. But they stand like grim and hoary sentinels all along the highway of our American history, and they will not fail to bring us to a halt as soon as we undertake to pass them by without doing due honor to their historic position and significance. We owe it therefore to ourselves and to the generations yet to come, to look these facts fully in the face and to make such account of them as the present and the future success of the Reformed faith, and the honor of the German name, may require. No one inspired with the true genius of our Republican liberties, would advocate any abridgement of popular rights, either in Church or State, nor could this be done without flying in the face of the universal tendency of the age. But it is also true that that order of individualism, which is tending to disruption, disunion and consequent weakness and injury to all the higher interests of the Church and the commonwealth, is no longer sustained at the bar of intelligent popular opinion. What the people now want is, liberal but powerful governments, able to guarantee safety of person and property, and to secure all the advantages of a broadly developed Christian civilization. And as these are the demands of modern political economy, so the same comprehensive genius must govern the evangelical or churchly and beneficent movements of the age. If we are wise, therefore, we will waste no time in finding fault with the unpleasant facts of our past history, but we will be careful to pursue a more rational course in the future, and join hands for the execution of liberal schemes.

Thus far we have had an eye mainly to the mistakes and losses of the past, and it is now time that we should turn our faces more particularly towards the future, and in the shadow of coming events, endeavor to inaugurate a policy more in keeping with the signs of the times than the habits of former days.

After an experience of more than a century we have at last come, as we remarked before, to a tolerably compact order of Presbyterial government in the Reformed Church. In this respect we are in advance of the Lutheran Church, which is more akin to Congregationalism in its theory of church government, than the organic law we recognize and maintain. But the genius of an organic formal unity has not yet gained such entire sway over our denominational mind and energies, as to lift us fully out of the misery of our Germanic individualistic disorder. The old German Adam seems to be still living, with his characteristic want of ability to comprehend the American situation and to act promptly with an eye to measures of permanent success. This chronic evil is still in greater force in some sections than in others, but the whole body is weakened by its disorganizing tendencies. Indeed it looks just at this time as if there was to be a wholesale revival of our chaotic proclivities. It would be rash, and hence unwise to say, that some of the deliverances of the late General Synod must necessarily lead to this bad result; yet we may be permitted to suggest that they seem to look emphatically in that direction. If, by this time, we are become sufficiently wide-a-wake and cohesive to master our inveterate constitutional aptness for running into individualistic confusion and to keep our theoretic and other differences within rational bounds, no evil will come from the logic of late events. But should passions and prejudices like those of by-gone days be allowed to rule our cause, we will not pass through the wilderness of our coming denominational career without leaving wrecks and ruins behind, such as we have been so often forced to behold amid the sad reminiscences of past generations. And should we fail now to meet the emergency, it would simply be one more proof that we belong to a national stock that is constitutionally deficient in some of the necessary qualifications for popular self-government, and that the disasters with which we so often meet are the result, at least in a great measure, of a want of far-sighted adaptation to circumstances.

These may be apparently sweeping conclusions, and we have not drawn them without a lively sense of the gravity of the situation. By passing this judgment we feel that we are one of the prisoners at the bar, and that sentence falls upon us no less than upon others of the same kith and kin; but for better reasons than this do we regard it as a sacred duty, on the one hand, to pass our criticism squarely and fairly, and on the other, to warn frankly against the folly of a wholesale condemnation. If we have failed in some things for reasons given, we have done nobly also in other things, and the rising character of this nation will owe some of its noblest traits to the constitutional make of the stock to which we belong. If in practical enterprise we have been outrun, we may at least claim the high honor of giving depth and stability to American culture and of aiding our young nationality in grappling with the deeper issues of our intellectual and religious life. What we are particularly concerned about now, however, is to get into the channel of greater practical activity and success, which is precisely the matter in which we have been wanting. Our seminaries and colleges are not sufficiently endowed, and we need one or more central institutions on a broad scale to give us status and strength equal to our demands, and the machinery of our benevolent operations needs to be enlarged tenfold. It is exceedingly unfortunate, therefore, that there should be still a seeming incapacity for rising to a level with this emergency, by taking measures at once, as a body, through which our interests as a denomination might be firmly secured. If such measures will not prevail it will neither be for the lack of means or resources, nor for that of genuine Christian piety; but the real cause must be sought for in that Germanic want of unity, which has brought many sad calamities upon the noble race which has been so long and so largely afflicted with it.

But here let us say that there are facts at hand which show that we have some capacity at least for generous measures of popular enterprise. The larger ecclesiastical bodies, with all their native weakness and want of compact organic unity in a truly popular or American sense, have made steady progress in all the elements of a vigorous, orderly, intelligent and well-organized church activity, and some of the smaller bodies, having a more centralized form of government, or being in other respects more favorably situated for generous culture, have displayed a degree of missionary activity, of practical aggressive energy, and even of social refinement, not surpassed by any of the Anglo-American communities in the land. And all this goes to prove certainly that, if only the proper conditions are allowed to rule, we may compare favorably with others on the practical arena of American benevolent and religious progress. But this very fact, it seems to us, is also conclusive evidence that the present crisis demands something better at our hands than the introduction of measures, in any way calculated to hinder or prevent a closer and more efficient organization of our popular resources. Consolidation and combination on a broad scale is what the issues of the times require, and should we be weak and blind enough to let our golden opportunity once more slip from beyond our grasp, then surely should we not be offended if some one would take us severely to task for being most lamentably slow in learning the manners of true Americans. Others know how to enjoy their individual freedom in connection with the most comprehensive and solid organization, and how to enter into voluntary combinations for general ends without being everlastingly defeated in their aims by petty local and partisan differences, and, if we cannot learn to do the same thing in a reasonable degree, we should not hesitate to acknowledge that Germanic individualism is our misfortune and that the issues of American Christianity and civilization must ultimately fall to the care of Anglo-American Churches.

The difficulty of language is another matter, that claims attention in this connection. We have seen how it has hindered our progress in the past, and we may rest assured that it will do the same thing in the future if a more enlightened spirit or judgment will not come to rule in the case. We have heard many complaints about the neglect of the German and the wrongs done to it, and these complaints were likely not without just cause; but it would be a very easy matter to show that, if wrong was done, it was not all on one side. No one at all familiar with the facts can fail to know that very much of our best and most promising material has been driven from our communion by a narrow and arbitrary adherence to the mother tongue, in many cases where the progressive demands of American life made a change of language both necessary and wise. Now, as far as our native born German membership are concerned, this trouble is no longer of so serious a character—they begin to fall in readly with the current of the times and the rising generation will carry the language with them to their graves. Our foreign-German membership however, as a body, can hardly be expected to look at this matter at once with a truly American eye, and to manage it with such a degree of practical judgment as the surrounding circumstances require. Yet this much ought to be clearly understood by all, that our American churches of German origin and character can have no permanent existence here except in the language of the country, and that in proportion as this is ignored a blow is struck at the very existence of the faith we wish to preserve. If it is the duty of the English portion of our members to aid the Germans in missions and otherwise—a duty that should be wisely and cheerfully discharged–it is also the duty of the Germans to join heartily in the promotion of English enterprises, with a view not only to make provision for those who do not understand the German, but to prepare congenial homes for their own rapidly English growing children. This is accordingly, at once, a profound scientific problem and a question of intense practical significance, worthy to be discussed and mastered by all in the interest of our German Christianity. And again would we say, if it should appear in the course of time that we have not been able to settle or solve the problem in a rational way, it will be another proof that our Germanic individualism was too strong for the success of the faith of our fathers; and if such should be the result of our want of practical forecast, what would all our professed devotion to Reformed orthodoxy amount to?

We have said that we need combined effort, on a large popular scale, in behalf of the various progressive schemes and interests claiming our attention, and a vigorous, intelligent, co-operative, denominational spirit to push forward the measures of a comprehensive Anglo-German enterprise. May we not suggest now, that along with this movement of the people in their united capacity, munificent contributions from wealthy individuals, in the style and manner of Anglo-Americans, would help the cause of our Germanic progress immensely and give us a commanding position in the most advanced circles of our rising nationality? We have men of large means, although not so many as some others; but if we once become fully conscious of the claims of our Teutonic origin and mission, and begin to feel the warm glow of our distinct national life pulsating strongly in unison with the popular heart of this nation, we trust that noble spirits will not be wanting who, with one grand master-stroke of generous munificence, will place our missionary and benevolent enterprises and our various educational institutions on as broad a basis as those founded by other nationalities. When that day comes all occasion for swan-like notes of woe, in the midst of death-like struggles for national and denominational self-preservation will have an end, and we may with one heart and voice shout the merry songs of genuine festive joy.

Having thus glanced, but briefly, at Anglo-Germano-American individualisms and their results, we trust that we have furnished at least some material for earnest reflection on the questions which the subject involves. Let the reader now take up the subject, study it, and draw such lessons, or conclusions, from it as he may see fit.

ART. VIII.—THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE IN AMERICA.*

"AMERICA is, as yet, merely on the threshold of its theological existence; but the future of Protestantism greatly depends upon the further development of this powerful nation, delivered, as it now is, from the curse of slavery. It is on this account that the maintenance and increase of its acquaintance with German theology and its acquisitions is of incalculable importance. At present the disruption of parties is great, and their opposition often more a matter of caprice or external interest than one likely to result in earnest scientific controversy. But the more a feeling for theological science increases, and with it that power of reasoning in which a unifying power is inherent, because its aim is the universally and absolutely true, the more will many of the existing denominations necessarily disappear, and others enter upon such a process of mutual understanding as will secure a common history of their intellectual and religious life, which, like that of Great Britain, may vie, on equal terms and with fruitful results, with German theology."—*Dr. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology.*

Dr. Hodge's Theology and Prof. Fisher's History of the Reformation are among the latest American theological works, and they may be taken as an evidence of the independent interest and activity in theological science in this country, and an earnest of what we may expect in this direction. The former of these two works we have already briefly noticed as it was leaving the press. It is now completed, and consists of three large volumes, the first treating of Theology proper, the second of Anthropology, the third of Soteriology and Eschatology.

---

* SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Charles Hodge, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vols. I. II. III., New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co. London and Edinburg: T. Nelson and Sons, 1873.

THE REFORMATION. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co., 1873.

We refer to it now again as a specimen of the independent activity and research beginning to show themselves in theological science in this country. Dr. Hodge's Theology has been favorably received and noticed both in this country and in England. It is an epitome of old Calvinistic theology, somewhat modified, though to no large extent, by the progress of theological thinking in our own times.

Prof. Fisher's work is a contribution to historical theology, which is at once a credit to its author and to the study of Church history in this country. It is all the more significant that it comes from Puritan New England. That section has not been behindhand, as we well know, in intellectual activity and work. What they did in the early colonial times in the interest of education, in founding colleges, and what they have done in more recent times in liberally endowing their institutions of learning, affords abundant testimony in this respect· New England has been the thinking head for a large portion of this country, and Boston, as we know, claims to be the literary metropolis of the American Republic. New England, too, is distinguished for the theological activity of its earlier times. The senior and junior Edwards, Hopkins, Bellamy, Emmons, Dwight, and Taylor, were divines who made no small stir in the provincial life of New England in their day. But Puritanism was constitutionally narrow and contracted from the beginning. It did not breathe the free air of the Reformation as a whole, but employed its energies in asserting its freedom from English conformity. It was not a part of the original reformation, but a much smaller movement in the secondary stages of that great Awakening.

The Puritan theory of the Church was exceedingly narrow and weak. Of a divine constitution or economy of grace, having a real objective existence in the world, they seemed to have no idea whatever. Their only thought was of the conversion of individuals, and these congregating together, and entering into covenant with God (not *He* with them, after the Scriptural examples) constituted a Church. Each congregation formed an independent Church. There was no thought of an organic body, in union with which all the parts must stand. There was little comprehension of the sacraments or mysteries of the kingdom of grace. As a consequence of such individualistic or atomistic theory of Christianity, there could be little sense for the meaning of Christian history. Of Christianity as an organic unfolding or process, reaching in living succession and unity from the Apostles down through the ages, they had no conception.

Thirty years ago the puritans of New England regarded the Apostles' Creed as a fossil, or relic, of an age with which the Church of the present has nothing to do. The Bible took the place, for them, of the Apostolic Church, and Primitive Christianity after the apostolic age was in their eyes a barren desert. And yet it is from Prof. Fisher, of New England, that we now have a profound work on the Supernatural in Christianity, and also this History of the Reformation. What, it may be asked, is there strange in all that? The strange thing is the manner in which our author approaches his subject, compared with the New England method of viewing the Church thirty years ago.

After the manner of German writers, Prof. Fisher devotes no less than *eighty pages* of his book to *the preparation* for the Reformation. Let us follow him in his treatment in this introductory chapter: "The Protestant movement," he tells us, "is often looked upon as hardly less preternatural and astonishing than would be the rising of the sun at midnight. But the more it is examined, the less does it wear this marvellous aspect. In truth, never was a historical crisis more elaborately prepared, and this through a train of oauses which reach back into the remote past. Nor is it the fact that such events are wholly out of the reach of human foresight; they cast their shadows before; they are the objects of presentiments more or less distinct, sometimes of definite prediction." Then the author gives us different theories which profess to account for the Reformation. While the superstitious attributed it "to a certain uncommon and malignant position of the stars, which scattered the spirit of giddiness and innovation over the world;" others have looked upon it as a squabble of monks. Guizot considers it "an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." Others again see in it a transitional era, paving the way for free thinking or unbelief. Over against all these theories, the author regards the Reformation, first of all, as a movement within the domain of religion.

Tracing it to this central current of history, he finds it to possess a negative and a positive character ; negative in denying the errors of Rome, and positive in asserting its own principles, the authority of the Scriptures, and justification by faith alone. "It is evident, also, from the foregoing statement, that in Protestantism there was an objective as well as a subjective factor." So the terms "objective" and "subjective" have become domiciled in the English of New England! "As Protestantism in its origin was not an isolated event, so it drew after it political and social changes of the highest moment. Hence it presents a two-fold aspect. On the one hand, it is a transformation in the Church, in which are involved contests of theologians, modifications of creed and ritual, new systems of polity, an altered type of Christian life. On the other hand, it is a great transaction, in which sovereigns and nations bear a part; the occasion of wars and treaties ; the close of an old and the introduction of a new period in the history of culture and civilization."

Next we have a brief review of the rise of the Roman hierarchy and of its history during the middle ages, all in the line of Christian history. It is the Church still, not the Synagogue of Satan, even though it is marked with error and corruption. But it is especially in presenting the causes of the Reformation that he has brought out the idea that Protestantism is the legitimate outgrowth of the better life of the Romanism of the preceding ages, directed, of course by the Holy Ghost. The development of the national languages, which followed the chaotic period of the ninth and tenth centuries, with Dante and Petrarch in Italy, Langland, Wickliffe, and Chaucer in England, and others in Germany and France, shows how the new tongues were taking the place of the Latin.

"Teutonism was holding its first initiatory struggle with Latin Christianity." The development of the science of jurisprudence raised up a class of legists who could defend the rights of the State against the encroachments of the Church. The long political struggle to become free from a hierarchy which, while calling itself spiritual, placed its heel upon the necks of kings and emperors, at length broke the spell by which the peoples of Europe seemed for a thousand years to be bound.

Coming to the inner circle of causes, we have confronting us the reaction in the sphere of the Christian religion, the theologians before the Reformation, breaking loose from the bonds of a dead scholasticism, and the uprisings among the people in various sects. The spread of mysticism, and with it humanism, together with the great revival in letters and learning, and the wonderful inventions and discoveries of the age, marked this as one of the great epochs in the history of the Church.

The writer moves here somewhat in the same spirit as Dorner in his introductory Chapter to his History of Protestant Theology, or Dr. Schaff in his Principle of Protestantism. Here is a wonderful step of progress for New England. When this theory of Church History, the theory of historical development, was given out from Mercersburg over a quarter of a century ago, it was regarded as dangerous, Romanizing. Now it has become familiar in the theological literature of this country, and quite at home even in New England.

In the latter portion of the work the author devotes a chapter of thirty-seven pages to the struggle of Protestantism in the seventeenth century, and another of some thirty pages to a sketch of the history of Protestant theology. This chapter is necessarily general and brief. It does not present the movement of theology in the deep, penetrating, and forcible way Dr. Dorner presents the subject in his work; but it shows, nevertheless, that the author grasps the underlying principle of the Protestant history down to the present time. Here is development, too. We no longer stand in the age of the Reformation. Three centuries intervene. While that epoch or age was formative for Protestant faith, and always will be looked back to by Protestants as containing high authority in its confessions, yet these confessions are not to be set up as popes for all subsequent ages. If all history back of the Reformation could not bind the conscience or faith when the Church departed from the Holy Scriptures, neither can this Protestant tradition bind us absolutely now. All this seems strange in a New England book. German works are familiarly quoted, German words and terms introduced into the text, altogether we seem to be in a different atmosphere from what used to envelop Puritanism in New England.

And this explains to a large extent the change that is coming over the theological science of that section. Intercourse with German theology and German literature has well nigh already revolutionized the theological thinking of New England, or at any rate of its leading scholars and theologians. Some of this German influence some years ago was not of a most healthful kind. Some of our Yankee savans turned transcendentalists, and were in danger of being led captive by the rationalism of Germany. But the healthful theology of Germany as it is renovated in this century is doing a good work there.

The large, growing centres of learning in New England have done much to enlarge and liberalize thinking. Their colleges have grown into Universities. Their professors are in communion with the progress of learning in the Universities of the Old World. They have representatives from those Universities among them. Hence it is no longer the spirit of England, or Scotland that rules, but rather the more cosmopolitan spirit of the continent of Europe. And this, ultimately, will undoubtedly be the spirit that will prevail in all departments in this country—cosmopolitan, not provincial.

The prevailing element in our American nationality from the beginning has undoubtedly been the English life and spirit, but this has become so intermingled with other nationalities, that while the English language will always be the prevailing language spoken in America, its life will be moulded rather by the continent. This may easily be seen in our life generally now already. The American is not selfish, reserved, reticent, like the Englishman. He is liberal, broad, and free, at least his aspiration and tendencies are in that direction. How could it be otherwise, if we consider the constant influence exerted among us by the various nationalities of Europe. The influences from the continent are growing stronger and stronger. The main stream is from Germany, and it has back of it the great learning and power of thought in the fatherland. We do not mean by this that Germany is about to erect itself into a controlling element in our American life, *as Germany*. That is a vain thought. German language and German peculiarities soon give way before American life. But the passing out of view of the particular European national peculiarities nevertheless leaves behind a moulding power in our national life.

What is true in general here, is especially the case in the sphere of theology. Not English, nor Scotch, nor French, but German theology, will be the main element from across the ocean, in moulding our theological science here in America. And yet it will be in no slavish way that this moulding influence will be received. Our situation and calling are peculiar. The United States, already one of the greatest powers in the world, destined it may be to become the greatest—cannot merely imitate Europe, or borrow from it, but it must reproduce the various life and spirit that reaches her from abroad.

America has already commenced a literature of her own. She has historians and poets whose claims are recognized in Europe. Perhaps least has been done in theology. This has been owing, it may be, to the intensely practical and secular spirit of the nation, developed during the times of its settling and bringing under control a new country.

The Middle States, with their smaller colleges and seminaries, have been in advance of New England in cultivating communion with German philosophy and theology. Especially is this the case in the German Churches, the Reformed and Lutheran. What is only now beginning to be taken up and used in New England, has been familiar among them for many years. But in the Middle States, in those smaller institutions, there are fewer facilities for literary work. Their libraries are small, and their professors have scarcely any time to spare from the work of the class-room. Let the German Churches once come up to the liberality of New England, in enlarging their institutions, and they will be able to raise up a class of men who can take their place in contributing to the growing theological literature of America. Meantime we rejoice to see the progress in this direction in the larger seminaries elsewhere in the country.

Prof. Fisher's work has its defects. Some of these are incident to the plan of bringing so much within the compass of one volume, but it will on this account be welcomed by many who have not the time or taste for reading a number of volumes in order to get a correct knowledge of the general facts of the Reformation.

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS.—As the present number of the REVIEW has been devoted mainly to articles on the Old Catholic Movement, we have been compelled to hold over several articles intended for this number of the REVIEW. They will be inserted in the July number. Thanking the contributors for their articles, we trust they will be satisfied with our explanation.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1873.

ART. I.—CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

BY REV. J. O. MILLER, D. D., YORK, PA.

WE speak of Christian ethics, Christian doctrine, and of Christian life, and in doing so, mean something real in morals, in faith, and in practice, by each of these terms, distinct and peculiar, as moulded by the Christian religion. Neither of these are the mere rules, opinions or acts of those who hold or practice them, as such, but are conditions of their lives, springing not out of their natural life, but from the revelation of God in Christ, working through their human powers. And by these they govern their doings and dealings with God and man. In the same way, when we speak of *Christian Worship* we mean also something that is real, and not a mere fancy, or sentiment or opinion, much less a mere show or parade to the eye, but a series of distinct acts in the way of homage and reverence to God. This homage expresses itself in adorations, confessions, supplications, thanksgivings and such like, and thus by outward acts expresses the inward movements of the soul as drawn out after God, in whom it believes, as revealed to it through Jesus Christ. Worship thus becomes a series of acts of faith, by which each one, who recognizes the Church of the Son of God, the Saviour, seeks to serve God through Him; endeavoring to imitate the example of Him who said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my father's business," and whose meat and drink it was to do the will of God. The Germans call worship, *Gottes-dienst*, to do God service, which is more expressive than our term worship, as it declares God to be the object of the service, not by mere formal or moral act,—but in acts and services through which man's whole inner life comes to a reverent and devout utterance. And yet when we add to our term worship, which is a general one used by pagan, Jew, or Christian, the qualifying word *Christian*, we express even more than the German term "Gottes-dienst," as we mean thereby, that all our services are not simply directed to God, but associated with and performed *in* and *through* Christ, as "the way, the truth, and the life," through whom alone we have access to God, and by whom we expect acceptance even in the least and most imperfect service.

Worship is the sublimest act in which man or angel can engage. And when it is Christian, and of faith it is the crowning act of our lives. As contrasted with ethics, and doctrine, and the philosophy of religion, worship we may say, is the poetry of religion, in which the æsthetic become extatic, as the soul rises to the apprehension of God in Christ, and finds "joy inexpressible and full of glory," in the grace returned to it through the channels of devotion which it employs.

Christian *Cultus* comprehends more than is designated commonly by the term Christian worship, of which we now treat. Cultus signifies not only what man does towards or for God, but also what God does, and is ever doing *for* man, *in* man, and *through* man *to* man, comprehending him in a new-creating, life-sustaining power, which moulds his whole life to its end, whilst Christian worship as commonly understood, presents only the one side of cultus, namely that which *man* does; in which the rational emotional, and social of man, under the guidance of faith in the Son of God, goes out after God, in adoration, confession and prayer, etc. As thus viewed it is a perpetual thanksgiving to God for His mercy in Christ, "offering up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." 1 Peter ii. 5. Fault at times is found with the erection of fine and costly church edifices, with elaborate frescoings and paintings therein, containing magnificent and grand organs and choirs to aid the worshipers in the elevation of their soul in devotion by pouring forth heavenly strains of music and rapturous song, And all, simply because they say primitive Christians did not worship so, and we are not instructed to do so. But it may be replied that the same objection would hold good in all our affairs of life; men do not till the soil, nor build their houses now as they did then. Should we refuse the machinery of modern times because our fathers did not have them? Christianity is historical and makes room for progress. Besides there is nothing in the Scriptures forbidding to make God's house and worship glorious, so long as nothing is done inconsistent with His character. Christianity has no absolute model to follow, either as to the place or manner of worship, it is a law to itself; and yet it is not stationary, except in holding on to the elements which the Divine Founder gave to it in the beginning as a guide and rule. Therefore Christian worship, consistent with the life out of which it springs calls in every age all the natural and human agencies and powers to aid it in its devotions. Not only art with its architecture, sculpture, poetry, painting and music, but learning and literature, science and skill, have laid their offerings in man's hands to aid him in perfecting his worship. And when once worship shall be perfected, from every redeemed soul, forever the whole militant Church, then triumphant, shall break forth, as in the beginning of creation, "When the morning stars sang together and the Sons of God shouted for joy," —into one universal shout of glory to Christ—the liturgy of heaven. And that will be a grander scene, and in a more perfect temple than man ever built, with words and music, in which there will be neither error nor discord, surpassing all that earth has ever seen or known. "For eye hath not seen," etc. 1 Cor. ii. 9.

In that school of faith and worship at Bethany, where the disciples asked Christ to teach them how to worship (Luke xi.

1), it is true they asked only to be taught in one of its modes, namely, prayer, but that one is the most universal among men, and represents the whole order of worship. When men have not the word or sacraments, too ignorant to read, blind to see, or no voice to sing—it is said of them as Christians the world over, "*behold they pray.*" When the disciples asked Christ to teach them, they signified not simply the necessity for worship, but that they needed to be *taught* in regard to its form and contents. Worship then we say in its simple or sublime form is a *divine art*, which under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, through the Church, each disciple must learn.

DESIGN OF WORSHIP.

Worship is a service in which, in some way, all people in all times have engaged; it is suggested by man's instincts; was included in the first injunctions of God to man in Eden; is in fact a constituent necessity of man's being. And when man is found so blinded by spiritual ignorance, or debased by passion, as to be unconscious of God Jehovah and His claims; though he professedly rejects idolatry or hero-worship, his instincts compel him to worship something, and he will turn in and worship or at least adore himself, as the greatest good. The design of this instinct which prompts man to worship, and the revelation which enjoins it, is, not simply to afford the soul of man an opportunity to express its reverence, gratitude and praise to God, but also, that man may find in it the means of unfolding his inner life. This design pervades the heathen, the Jew, and Christian alike; yet in Christianity only as the absolute religion it reaches properly the end proposed. And to accomplish this design it demands a two-fold character of worship on the part of man, namely, *private* and *public* worship. *Public* Christian worship then, is not designed merely to be a proclamation on the part of the gospel to the world, to call it to repentance, but is an act of adoration on the part of the pious whereby he is enabled to unfold his spiritual life, which could not be perfected in secret in the same way or to the same degree. Public worship in the Church, is a perpetual thank-offering unto the Lord, a perpetual incense going up before Him who is Holy. Worship, as such, is designed then to quicken the Christian life in the souls of them that believe; and sustain the life already existing, through the word and sacraments, whilst every act private or public is an offering of the soul in the way of thanksgiving and praise to God, through Jesus Christ. And however strengthening the private devotion of the closet is if done in faith, the highest and holiest act in which man engages, is the public worship and adoration of a whole congregation, the miniature of heaven, "where the congregation ne'er breaks up and the Sabbath has no end."

Worship stands related to man's moral nature, in the same way as language does to his intellectual being; in it the soul finds its proper utterances. And he that does not worship God, has as yet not come to a knowledge of the wants of his inner life. And so long as Christian worship, whether private or public, is regarded as a mere formal observance of God's claims on man, without its being a personal school of devotion to draw out man's religious life into communion with God, through Christ, it fails to reach its design. And so long as, is in its collective form it is not made a perpetual offering of gratitude to God—in which the praises of the inferior kingdoms, find their utterances through man's intelligence, we take not in its complete design. For as these inferior orders of existence look up to man, and find in him the proper utterances of praise; so man in turn looks up to the mediatory person of Christ, and through Him offers himself a living sacrifice of faith to the Eternal Father. In Christ by the Holy Ghost, each act of faith is an act of worship, by which man does the will of God, and receives in return the testimony of a good conscience that he pleases God.

ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

The fundamental elements of Christian worship are the divine word and the sacraments. And out of these grew the minor but still essential parts of worship, still retained, and which must ever remain, namely the reading and exposition of the Sacred Scriptures, the meeting in fraternal fellowship, the collecting of alms, the breaking of bread in the distribution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and prayer. Christian worship, thereby differing from that of nature or heathenism, rests upon the *Divine Word* and *Sacraments*, through which it reveals God to man, and man to himself. This word herein not simply as written, as law or rule, for in that form it is only the record of the revelation, rests upon the ever living, present person of Christ, the true and only revelation of God to man. He is both the ground and medium through whom all our offerings come up before God acceptably. He says, "I am the way, etc." (John xiv. 6). "Where two or three meet, etc." (Matt. xviii. 20). As the Eternal Son, He is not only the object of worship, as God—but in His divine-human person, as the Son of Man and the Son of God. All revelation came down from God to man through Him, so all worship goes up through Him and in Him finds its meaning and end.

The proper use of the word preached and expounded, and the administration of the Sacraments which it includes as signs and seals of grace, lie at the foundation of all Christian worship. And from these under the Holy Ghost all other minor parts of worship have developed themselves in the Church. Christ it is true prayed, and left us a model prayer. He sanctioned by their use the different parts of Jewish cultus, still the word and sacraments He appointed lay at the basis of all these. Prayer, fellowship, the giving of alms and praise are but the rational, social and emotional responses of man's quickened and renewed nature, in those who had been awakened and regenerated by the Holy Ghost; who worship God in Christ and have fellowship with each other. And whilst the necessity for worship grounds itself alike in a God-consciousness in the heathen, the Jew, and the Christian, the elements of Christian worship differ from all others, having been specially appointed of Christ for the use of His people. These it is true were administered and symbolized in other forms of religion; but they had not the word and the sacraments in the form which the Church has them now, their's was only an instinct, or a prophecy and type of them. And these Christ taught His apostles, together with a form of prayer; and these the Church, which is his body, under the Holy Ghost, "which takes the things of Christ and shows them unto men," is to teach to her children, so that they may worship God in spirit and in truth.

FORM OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

Neither Christ nor His apostles prescribed any particular mode of worship that should be absolute and binding forever. In these times in which we live we have almost an endless diversity of forms of worship among professed Christians, each claiming authority for such as they make use of. Yet who can show from Scripture or history that Christ or His apostles confessed or signified a mode that should last through all time, or that this or that is the absolute one. Christ, though He appointed elements of worship, word and sacraments, and gave a model prayer, yet never fixed a *mode* of their use; nor did the apostles, after they applied them, signify the manner of their use for all times. We hear much said of *Bible* worship, but no specific mode is appointed in the New Testament. The worship of the Old Testament was all prescribed by God, its times, places and ritual, but Christ was the end of these, and hence they are not binding, except as reproduced in His life and Spirit. And to His Church which He founded in His own person, when redemption was completed, He gave no absolute form or mode to observe, that should not be changed. They solicited Him to teach them to pray. He did so by giving them a model, the most perfect prayer, but did not say they were to use none else. He gave them the word, and appointed two sacraments, but did not prescribe the manner of preaching or how they should administer the sacraments. He said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,—go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. xxviii. 18-19). Having instituted the other Sacrament, he said, "This do in remembrance of me," (Luke xxii. 19). And so He also commended fellowship and prayer, having given them a model prayer and enjoined upon them to meet to pray. (Matt. xviii. 20). But nowhere does he prescribe the particular mode; He left all these acts and duties, which are the elements of worship, to that regenerative life, in His people, which is His own life in the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to develop these from age to age, to suit the religious wants of each. And whilst Christian doctrine seemed in the beginning to assume a fixed form, as to its general conception, in the confession of Peter, in the name of the rest of the apostles saying, "*thou art the Christ*," the divine in the human, and in the early councils this was thrown into the form of creeds, which still bind the faith of the Church; yet even these were not to be looked upon as fossils of a past age to be handed down as a tradition; but the Church in each age is still seeking to comprehend their contents. But even this fixedness did not hold in worship, as even in doctrine, and its forms have more or less changed in every age, whilst the elements have remained the same. Then to say we must go back to the days of Christ and the apostles, we must go to the Bible for a form: or say ours is the form of Christ and His disciples, and thus overlook all the centuries which have since intervened, is overlooking the work and mission of the Holy Ghost. And whatever they may find in doing so, they will not find a prescribed form of worship, made binding on any age, much less upon all ages.

And what is affirmed of Christ, may be said of His apostles, they appointed no form of worship. And yet we hear persons speaking of *Apostolic* worship, with a view to give authority to a particular mode, with as much pedantry, as some speak of apostolic succession, which is made to depend upon a mere outward, tactual connection, which is compelled to find its links in some obscure passage under ground for ages to keep its connection. This so-called apostolic worship in the same way must have passed through many changes in the Church in the ages that have intervened between the present and the times of the apostles, so that no model taken from the Scriptures would suit in all respects its varying forms. The apostles used on the day Penteost the essential elements appointed by Christ, preaching, fellowship, breaking of bread and prayer, in the organization of the Church. And yet nowhere do we find them saying, this is the mode in which they are to be used, or afterwards laying down any rule in any of their Epistles. And yet the Church from that time forth, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, assumed for itself such forms and modes of worship, in the centuries which have intervened for better or worse, as was thought suited to their times.

Had Christ been a mere man, ever so great or good; a Moses, Confucius, or Mohammed, He, might without solicitation have laid down and prescribed a form of ritual for his followers. Had He done so, however, He would have weakened His claims on the faith of the world in favor of His divinity. For He would have acted as one who did not know "all things," and have appointed an order that would not have suited the ages that have since intervened. Like the civilization of China, which compels every sized foot into the same shoe, producing deformity and crippled growths, so would a fixed form for all ages in the Church have crippled its cultus, and stultified its growth. His divine wisdom as the Son of God, foresaw through all coming ages of the church, and knew its wants, and what was required in each age for the development of the seed which He scattered. Having therefore appointed sacraments, having furnished them with His instructions, and a model of prayer, and by His mediation secured to Himself all power and authority in heaven and earth, He said, therefore "go preach," "baptize," "do this until I come again,"—and I will send you the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost—He shall take of Mine and show it unto you—and, "Lo I am with you always," as the surest pledge that all needed power, grace and wisdom should not fail the Church in the darkest ages of its history. And having finished all these instructions He lifted His hands in gracious benediction, and passed out of their sight, in the visible form which He still had though in a glorified state, and passed to the right hand of the Father, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and dead.

But whether His people should kneel or stand when they pray, whether they should sing or chant their hymns, how they should preach or teach the sacred Scriptures, how they should baptize subjects of the kingdom, and how they should distribute the sacred elements of the Supper, or how they were to tell their joys or sorrows, or how erect places of worship and how ornament them, and whatever detailed appliances they should use in worship, of these Christ made no appointment, gave no direction. All these things were left for their Christian life to develop, each age for itself, under the direction of the Holy Ghost.

ALL PUBLIC WORSHIP LITURGICAL AND FORMAL.

Although no specific form was enjoined by the Saviour in the use of the essential elements of worship, we still hold that all worship when it becomes public and social, as engaging more than the devotions of one is of necessity liturgical and formal, yet not lifeless and spiritless on that account, but the opposite. Liturgy, from *λειτος εργον*, means a public work, an office in which many are engaged, as distinct from one. Public worship implies that it is a common work for many, it cannot be done by proxy, by minister or choir, or both for the people, and in which all should in some way join, so as to be able in the end, says the Apostle, to respond, Amen.

The Old Testament service was not only fixed in form, but it was thoroughly liturgical—this was so from no arbitrary decree of God, who saw fit to give a fixed form as best adapted to His ancient people, but because it lies in the very nature of worship, and especially of public worship, to be liturgical. And because Christ saw fit to give no fixed form but made room for freedom, to each age to unfold its own form, this freedom did not take from worship its liturgical character. The prayer He taught, to say *Our* Father, implied something done in common. And the same runs through every other part of worship, so far to be participated in as to be able in the end with heart or lips, or both to respond, Amen.

As well might we think of supporting our physical life without food, without the formalities of eating, drinking, sleeping, and of labor or rest, as to be a Christian without worship, and that worship to comprehend times, places and forms, in which each takes some part, in order to exercise the gifts and powers of his renewed life. Worship is not for the closet or family only, but for the public assembly of God's people. And hence it needs not only its Sundays, churches, times and places for worship, but that those there assembled, should in some way take part therein. And this makes it liturgical and formal at once. And the highest, and most sacred, and spiritual act, yet the most liturgical and formal act of the assembled people of God is the Sacrament of Christ's body, the breaking of bread, and partaking of one cup, as the bond of fellowship and holy charity and communion also with the person and life of Christ. It is here that each one offers himself a new, a living sacrifice, yet in common with others, and together with Christ, on the altar of the gospel, and, confesses Christ as God, to the glory of the Father.

The Redeemer, in founding a visible church, presupposes an external service of God, which must have forms for its public acts in which all are to engage, and thus it is necessarily liturgical and formal. It must have preaching and administration of Sacraments, it must have its hymns and prayers in which all unite as an offering to the Lord, and all these as public acts, make it formal and so far liturgical. These forms must either grow out of the general spirit and life of the church, which adapts these services to meet the wants of the worshipers, agreeably to the original elements furnished by Christ; or each one who conducts the worship of others in whole or in part, must go back to the original sources, and draw from thence, through his own mind and heart a fresh supply, and throw it into form for the people. There being no prescribed form that shall compel the individual worshiper, or the Church collectively to its use, provided the word and sacraments are held fast to, it becomes a matter of choice, of religious taste and piety in worshiping, to honor Christ, and secure our greatest edification, whether we shall accept the spontaneous preparations of the one who leads, or the forms of order, the hymns and prayers and selections of Scripture which the Church furnishes out of her general life and experience. But in either case, whether, so called, extemporaneous worship (which is never strictly extemporary, for its hymns are prepared, and its prayers run after the same form) or that which is a fully written order of worship, it is liturgical and formal if the people take part in its rendering.

It is arbitrary assumption, to say the least, on the part either of those who approve of fixed and prescribed forms entirely in their worship, or those who use them in part, or those (if there are such) who depend entirely upon the impulses of the officiating minister in dispensing the word and Sacraments, to say the rest are wrong, or that they are formal for doing so, or that they are not liturgic for not following certain forms, if they use the appointed elements of worship. For all public worship is of necessity formal and liturgical, and it becomes decidedly so, where the people take any part in the service. But when persons object to forms of worship, and repeating what was prepared by others and used before, as injurious to piety, then they do not only thereby condemn their own practices in singing the hymns of others with which they edify their hearts and praise God, but they charge a want of piety upon the Divine Founder of Christianity, who in the most trying hour of His passion, used such forms, for those memorable words, "*My God why hast Thou forsaken me*," and "*Into thy hands I commend my spirit*," are found in the twenty-second and thirty-first Psalms.

DOES ANY AGE FURNISH A MODEL?

We may now ask is there any rule to govern the Church on the subject of worship? And if so, what is the rule? Is any age or period of the Church to be a model or pattern for all others? which is it? Or is this a lawless relation, and the Church continually at sea on this subject of worship? Surely there must be law and order in this as well as in doctrine, discipline or government,—but it is in the sphere of freedom. The life of Christ in His people, under the Holy Ghost, is left to unfold itself in the way of cultus, as a new and regenerated life, and worship forms an important part of this cultus. And although each Christian finds his perfection in Christ, the Church as a whole will require the whole of history to realize its ideal, and consequently no age can become absolutely a model for a life, that is not yet perfected as a whole.

If Christ did not see fit to prescribe a form for all time, if His apostles did not in their advice to the Churches in their epistles lay down a rule, it is in vain we think to look to any age or period since then, and say this is the way in which all must worship. Neither the apostolic age nor that of early Christianity, neither the middle ages nor the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, the times that have since intervened, or the present, is the model for all time. Each formed its own mode and was aided in so doing by that which went before. The apostles were aided by the Jewish cultus; early Christianity, by the apostolic, and that which preceded it; that of the middle ages though interfered with, and controlled by the upheavals and changes in civil society, yet had for their aids the periods which preceded them, to develop their worship. The Reformation had all these, and whilst it saw fit to throw off much and return in part to forms of a preceding age, yet it did not do so entirely; for it used all that preceded it, and found its own peculiar cultus, and there was none absolutely like it before, because the same wants and circumstances did not exist before. And since then many changes have taken place, and many more will follow in the ages to come, for Christian cultus is not yet perfected, nor is the Church in whose bosom its office rests. The absolute, the perfect, the heavenly has not yet been reached by any part of the Christian Church.

And yet see what legacies, and what material these preceding ages have left us to aid us in our worship. Not to speak simply of the prayer of our Lord, the songs of the angels, of Simeon, Zacharias and of Mary—there are the creeds, the liturgies, hymns and collects of the early Church and of the middle ages, the Te Deum, Gloria in Excelsis and Gloria Patri and such like, with their music, sacred painting and architecture. What glorious hymns and chorals, what evangelical and practical expositions of Scripture and preaching of the Gospel, has not the Reformation period left us, together with many liturgic contributions. And since then what heavenly music, has been given to the Church to aid it in its devotions, which in one way or another is carrying up before the throne the praises of God's people, the whole world around. And even this age has much in the way of hymns and prayers, and modes of devotion are furnished to add to the material of coming ages.

The promise of Christ assures us, that the Holy Spirit as really overshadows and pervades the Church in every age of its existence, as it did in the apostolic age. (John xiv. 16). And if it does not inspire men in the same way or degree, to speak as oracles as did the apostles, since the canon of Scripture is completed, it still agreeably to the promise preserves the Church, in doctrine and in cultus, from being overwhelmed by the world and its spirit, which stands antagonistic to it, and seeks to control its life.

In this age we hear distinct, deep utterances, in many quarters asking for a speedy union of the Church, as comprehending not only all the parts of Protestantism, but the Roman, Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, and all who confess Christ as their Lord. And yet in the spirit of all these utterances comes up at the same time, from most, if not from each the wish that all the rest should change in what they differ, and become like them. In like manner there are diversities of *modes* of worship, and the same spirit in most instances, controls, and many say "*this* is the mode, and ours should be the *model, &c.*" This age need not flatter itself, and cry "*Eureka,*" "I have found it," any more than any preceding one in any one of its modes or forms of worship. For each subsequent age will seek its own as others before them have done. This age may adopt the best for itself and the wants of its people; and furnish *material* for the next; but that is all it can do. In doing this, it will have done a good work, and left a legacy to the many treasures that are being handed down to the Church of the *Future.*

Each age of the Church in coming years, will ask the Divine Master, as did the disciples, "Lord, teach us how to pray,"—how to worship, how to serve Thee most acceptably and for our edification. The subject will thus be still a matter of thought, and of inquiry as it is now. And it will be the duty of the Church, in the same manner in which she teaches doctrine, out of the experiences and history of the Church's life, but with authority only so far as she enforces the original elements of worship, to teach those committed to her care, *how* to worship God

PLACE AND TIMES OF WORSHIP.

Time and place of worship, have been implied in what we have said, and deserve some special notice. Worship, that by divine appointment has been made to take an external form among men, must take it in time and space to be real, and thus locate itself in the sphere of natural life, though it comprehends the spiritual,—since it is composed of elements which address themselves to the senses. And as worship in its internal state, to be real, requires to be in spirit and in truth, so in like manner in its external, it must occupy time and space. Nay man's finite life, as existing in the sphere of the senses demands that it should take *form* in space, and determine itself in times and *seasons*. Jesus said, it is true, to the woman of Samaria, "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father (John iv. 21), but, they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth," (ver. 24), but, every one knows, that this was said in opposition to that superstitious feeling which then prevailed, and which located His worship to a *single* place, whereas, Christianity was designed to take in the *whole* world. He said too, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up," (John ii. 19), but surely He did not mean that with the abolishing of the Temple and its service, the Church He was founding in its place should have no holy places where the offerings of its people should be paid. For such sacred places are demanded by the idea of the Church itself, and by social as well as public worship.

The temple and the synagogue, to which Christ and His apostles resorted to preach and worship, prepared the way for times and places of worship in the Christian Church ; in the same way as the Jewish cultus prepared the way for Christian worship itself. Nor are we to understand, because Paul in writing to the Galatians, (iv. 8-11), and Colossians (ii. 16), to both of whom he seems to repudiate times and seasons, saying, "Ye observe days and months and times and years"—"Let no man judge you in respect of a holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days"—that there were no fixed times of worship among the apostles or early Christians. For as the finite nature of man demanded a place, so the temporal character of his life demanded for the sake of devotion as well as order, days and hours for worship. Christ Himself and His apostles had their places of worship, to which they resorted daily and weekly and yearly, and so Christians have had ever since. Christ not only resorted to the temple and synagogue at the hours of prayer, but in the wilderness and on the mountain found a closet and times to pray. And the Apostles after the ascension of their Divine Master observed not only so long as the temple stood, the customs of the Jews, but had their own separate places and times for worship from day to day, and week to week in the breaking of bread. They gave spiritual and Christian significance to *Pentecost* and the *Passover*, which they not only celebrated, but considered them special seasons, and a privilege to spend them at given localities, with the Church organized there, and so remain as Paul did at Ephesus, (1 Cor. xvi. 8)—and promised to be with the Christians at Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 21) to keep the feast, and would allow nothing to hinder him.

Whilst it is true that every *place* is the Lord's, as a part of the great temple He has reared to Himself, and is so far holy to Him, for the earth is His and its fullness, and everywhere that men lift up "clean hands and a pure heart" will they be accepted of Him. Still some places are to us of necessity holier than others, because they are sacred to worship. The testimony of Christ and His apostles, and of Christians in all ages has been the same on this subject, as agreeing in this conviction. The *closet*, into which Christ directed His disciples to go, saying, "When thou prayest enter into thy closet," &c., (Matt. vi. 6), is one of these sacred places;—and to this the Christian retires one or more times daily to worship, finds it a delightful place, which he holds dear, and dare not neglect, and yet preserve personal piety. The *House*, the *Home*, is another place where worship *locates* itself. In this place the apostles and early Christians met to preach and pray, for fellowship and to break bread, to sing "Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making melody in their hearts unto the Lord." When as yet they had no public sanctuary to take the place of the Temple, the Church was in the *house.* And in these days of persecution that marked the early history of Christianity, even if they had been permitted to build church edifices, they were too poor. Besides it is probable that if they would have had such public places of worship, so long as they were not recognized as a distinct religion, their persecutions would have been greater, and for this reason too the church was confined to the house, and there their social worship was held. And they went from house to house, making each sacred to worship. And the house, the home of the Christian, is still sacred to worship, not only in missionary fields, and where means are not at hand; and each has, or *should* have, an altar erected in it, upon which daily offering should be laid by the family, and where the father as the head is to be the officiating minister. And yet the holiest of all for man is the *public sanctuary*, where many from their homes and closets gather to worship, where the word and sacraments are dispensed, and in it is furnished us the type of heaven. So soon as Christianity was recognized and protected as other religions were by the Roman Empire, Christians began to build church edifices, and dedicated them to the service of God, and calling to its aid science and art, through the inspiration of its own life, Christianity perfected a style of architecture (the Gothic) for its use, (a symbol of Christian life itself) to be imitated in the succeeding ages. And in these places Christians held their solemn assemblies, celebrated their holy sacraments, and worshiped collectively Him, who is not confined to temples made with hands, in spirit and in truth. And though the earth is God's temple, whose dome is the spangled heavens, and to whom the winds and the storms make melody and sound that repeat in rolling echoes His praise, yet He has not only promised to meet His people in houses made with hands, but to *dwell there ;* He calls it *His rest forever*, and where he will abide. "Let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them." (Ex. xxv. 8). And as necessary as is a home and table to sustain our natural life, so necessary is the sanctuary, with its word and sacraments to sustain our spiritual life.

And as to the *times* for worship, the same necessity that in man's social and sensuous nature called for a place in which to locate worship in his temporal life, calls for times and seasons to do the same. And these instinctive wants and tastes in man have been sustained by the appointments of God's word. The *morning* and *evening*, when man begins and ends his labors, are naturally suggested as appropriate times for worship by instinct and judgment, and observed by the pious in all ages, but sanctioned by the Holy Scriptures. Christ and His apostles observed such times, and so should we.

The *whole* of our Christian life should be a season of worship that should cover all our days and hours; for there is not a moment when we are not His, and controlled by the same relations, and in heaven this only can be realized, in the "assembly that never breaks up, and the congregation that knows no end." And yet there are some days that are holier than others, because God has set them apart for rest and worship; such for example as the *Christian Sunday*, kept as such by the apostles and first Christians, and still observed by the Church for special worship. And though there was no command given by the Lord on this subject, Christians from the beginning have felt that as Christ in fulfilling the law did not abrogate the spirit of that law, but condensed it into two commands of love to God and love to man, so in like manner, though the Jewish Sabbath passed away, He did not destroy the spirit of that appointment of a specific day or portion of a week for rest and worship. And hence was set apart, in the beginning, by universal consent, the first day of the week, which commemorated the resurrection of Christ, to take the place of the seventh, as a special day of worship, and it was their Sunday, and it still is ours. And meeting from house to house in their solemn assembly, on this day, which brought life and immortality to light, in observing sacraments and collecting alms, this day became as sacred to them as the Jewish day was to them. And so it has been with Christians ever since.

And these particular *seasons* suggested themselves in the beginning to Christians, and still do, as commemorating the principal events in Christ's life when on earth, and they in like manner became *sacred seasons* in the same way as Sunday was made sacred. And these in the Christian year stand out in contrast with seasons which are honored in the secular year by the world, and are consecrated by worship. One of the seasons is *Pentecost*, occurring at the same time that the Jewish feast by that name took place, but now sacred to the *founding of the Church* and the *outpouring of the Spirit*. And in the same way the apostles and early Christians Christianized the Jewish *Passover*, and made it *Easter*, with its week of passion preceding, in which the suffering and death of Christ for our sins were commemorated, which ended in His glorious resurrection on Easter morning. And these *two* seasons were observed with interest by the apostles already, (Acts xx. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 8; 1 Cor. v. 7—8), and are still by the Church. Then, too, *Pentecost* and *Easter*, are the only yearly festival seasons which are actually mentioned in the New Testament, and yet they imply another which has reference to the birth of Christ. These occurring at the times of leading Jewish feasts, took a Christian form and perpetuated themselves at once. The one was the festival of the *Son*, and the other of the *Holy Ghost;* that of the Father remained yet to take its place to complete the Sacred Three. The Church then under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, went back from that central season which commemorated the atonement and which culminated in the resurrection and effected a season for the *Father*, "who so loved the world as to send into it His only begotten Son," and called it *Christmas*, as commemorative of the incarnation. When and how long after the apostles the advent of Christ, the beginning of His theanthropic life, was celebrated, there is no definite knowledge. All we know is it was very early celebrated in the Church. And not only man's religious instinct feels the appropriateness of these three yearly festivals of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, but the Church has ever since held them as centres from which with the intervening Sabbaths, the church year was formed in distinction from the civil or secular year. And these seasons and Sundays, and mornings and evenings of each day are the times to be observed in a free and Christian spirit for Christian worship. And these times and these places the Christian needs to realize the whole of worship. His finite nature requires that he locate his worship, to perfect his faith, edify his soul, and complete so far as man can as yet complete the worship of Him who desires all that worship Him, to "Worship in spirit and in truth."

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION.

And while we thus speak we are aware that there exist now, and there have ever been, differences among Christians as to what is the best mode of worshiping God. It was so in the apostolic times; Paul, James and Peter differed; and the fact that Christ did not prescribe in detail a mode, made room for such differences. And the intervening periods have had their disputes on this subject, yet not with as much violence as upon doctrine, which was considered more vital. And if so, why should we not expect controversy still on this topic? Nor do we think such controversies wrong or injurious if conducted in a proper spirit; the Church is benefited instead of injured by them. Such discussions save the Church from extremes, show its freedom in Christ, and develop its spirit. Tastes, emotions and religious conceptions are very different in different people. Where one sees things beautiful and glorious, another sees nothing to admire; where one is elevated to raptures and thrilled with religious delight, to another it is formal and unprofitable; in one the imagination and the heart prevail, in another it is the judgment and the reason. And as the forms of worship make room for freedom there is room to differ. Only such differences and discussions should be carried forward in the spirit of Christian charity, as serving the Divine Master, and not as serving any selfish or party end, but to cultivate the spirit which teaches us all to say as Christians, Abba, Father, and that there are others who as sincerely as we pray, and as acceptably, "*Our Father, who art in Heaven.*"

And now may He who hears prayer, and by whom we come to God, teach us too *how* to pray, and consistent with His person and work on earth,—to worship the Father through Him. And teach us too, to exercise always the greatest charity towards those who confess the same Lord, but who do not understand His teaching precisely as we do, until we shall come to the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

When the Church shall have passed through her struggles in her militant state, when these differences of tongues and administrations shall cease, and all these modes and forms that marked her different epochs served their purpose, then all her prayers and hymns shall merge into one rapturous song, "and then none need teach us," and the song will be to Him that loved us, and "washed us from our sins in His own blood." (Rev. i. 5.)

When the voice of preaching shall cease, the sacraments, now signs and seals, be exchanged for the glorious presence of Christ, as faith now sees Him, as the feast of the soul, and those who now live by faith in the Word once made flesh, now glorified, shall themselves awake in His likeness and find Him their true and eternal life, *then*, and not until *then*, shall worship assume its perfect *form*. But even then its perfection cannot be stationary, but go on expanding and unfolding its Divine commission as our spirits shall unfold amid the scenes of eternal life.

ART. II.—FAITH—NORMAL AND ABNORMAL.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, PENNSBURG, PA.

THE Father of all men has set the organ of Trust in the human mind, just as He has placed vision in the eye, blood in our veins, or strength in muscle. Because we cannot lay our finger on it, is no valid reason for disputing its existence, since it still announces itself to our sensorium in a thousand ways.

Upon the healthy exercise of this instinct now, depends every man's history and every man's happiness. There is a volume of meaning contained in the Divine message—"If ye will not believe, surely, ye shall not be established." The littlest child confides instinctively in its parents, and consequently advances and matures. Said a girl of six summers: "It is so, for my mamma told me so; and if mamma says so, it is so, if it tain't so!" Erase that organ from its tender heart, and you cut at once, as it were, the only leading-string by which elders are enabled to conduct their offspring onward and upward.

It is by virtue of this instinct that the pupil is led on by his preceptor from the Alphabet to the domain of the Sciences. Without it, there is no beginning, even, to the process of education. You cannot *in*still or *in*form independent of it—however much you may *de*form. Husband and wife confide—one in the other. That is the "house-band," indeed, and the sinew of the marriage tie, far more than your anti-divorce laws manufactured at the Capital, to order.

And as in the household and school-room, so it is in society likewise. Man still believes in man, though it was hastily said by royal lips, "All men are liars." It is well that we can see and say otherwise in our leisure moments, or the social structure could not hold together. Not by laws and bayonets is the human fabric preserved, surely, or the French Empire would not have dissolved. By faith is mankind saved, whether we mean the individual or the mass. The stubborn wall unites and solidifies by the mortar and cement that pervade the crevices of stone and brick, rather than by the external layers of plaster. The timber propped against a reclining gable does but prophesy its speedy fall. So neither can you eventually prevent or forestall a national or social rupture by means of laws and penalties; by armies and navies; by any outside ligatures—save as these all grow out of the body politic, as spiders spin their silken threads from within themselves, without first importing them from China.

"Away with the credit system!" we hear it shrieked. "The cash principle is the only true principle," it is insanely added. But the man who teaches such a lesson, in any absolute sense, is not yet an abecedarian in social science. Nations and communities, all commonwealths, would dissolve like snow in August, were men not so constituted as to confide in one another. For man to trust in man, and in the Father of us all, is natural to the human mind. "Without faith it is impossible to please God," or man, or woman, or child; or, to be pleased either. "We are saved by faith," no less in this world than in that which is to come.

But organs, even, are liable to degenerate, and will consequently refuse to perform their respective functions aright. The eye may fester and convey a false vision; the ear may, for a similar cause, report a false sound. A maimed limb will halt or limp. So may our instinctive organ of Trust be interfered with and perverted. As pure gold or genuine currency becomes a *bogus* article or spurious medium, through an unlawful tampering, so may we look for a counterfeit faith to issue from a poisoned spring.

We may notice its several outgushings. The most distorted of all kinds of faith is Unbelief. It claims to be a wholly negative thing, to be sure; but it is positive credulity, still, since it believes that it believes in nothing—the most difficult of all creeds. But as no one is given to mistake a toad for the morning star, we are in no danger of confounding this very bad imitation with the genuine metal, and may at once dismiss it here.

There is a "dead" Faith which bears the same relation to the original, that the erst Continental and Confederate notes sustain to the Legal Tenders of the country. These may be said to have had some resident value once; but having that no longer, they are stored away in chests and drawers as mementos of bygone days and circumstances. In like manner, it is fair to concede, may such a mummified faith have had its par value formerly, since all that has died must once have been alive. Now, however, that virtue has gone out, and its corpse alone remaineth.

There is a species of "little Faith," which compares with the real, as the once current "farthing" does with a golden eagle. It is still true that four farthings are equal to a penny. A single such mite, then, in a man's pocket, may save from total bankruptcy. By analogy, a soul of little faith—of but a mustard seed in size—is still richer than when warped in unbelief or buried in a dead one. The frightened crew on Galilee's blue waters, whom the Great Captain reproached without an abatement in faith, was yet a better company than any cabal of infidels.

There is, finally, a wild and rank order of credence, which is commonly styled "Superstition." It is a deformed and monster creed, and stands related to the normal kind, as bad money compares with gold or silver coin, fresh from the mint. It is a counterfeit Faith. The world is full of it.

Now, as the social system demands a "Detector," whereby we may know more readily the genuine and pure currency, from the spurious and the mixed, let us set out for our moral welfare a like expedient, by which to distinguish at sight the element of Faith amid the crude mass of superstitious alloy. This we can best accomplish by means of a series of antipodes.

Faith in Superstitions differs as to their Origins and Sources.

As an organ, talent or capacity, all Faith is verily the gift of God—just as every other endowment is. But in its office, functions or exercise, it may assume a Divine, human or inhuman complexion, accordingly as the nature of the spirit is, which quickens the organ into life. If it be a Divine inspiration which indwells it, Faith is the opening of an internal eye, by which the mind is filled with light. The sun no more enlightens nature and bathes the universe in a sea of light than does such a mind walk in the light of God. "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." Hence Scriptural Faith is ever compared to the opening of an eye—to a new vision obtained. The faithful are of right then the "children of Light."

Should the eye that is in us, however, be blown upon by a desert simoon, or the hot and poisonous breath of the Evil One, then a spiritual amaurosis affects the organ—a blindness sets in which causes very darkness. It is possible for us to become stone-blind, whilst our eyes are still open, as when we are dazzled, or, lie in the vestibule of death.

Superstition is such a dazzling blindness to the mind. No man staggers more than the superstitious man. He forever fights phantoms. Like the inebriate, he sees mice, rats, toads, lizards and demons where there are none. He lives in a delirium. Every trifle is for him an omen. The overturning of a salt-cellar; the accidental dropping of a knife, fork or spoon; the crowing of some mannish hen; the howling of a dog—all these little things assume large proportions for him, worry him and make him afraid. Like some "familiar spirit" they chase him through life. He is haunted by mental spectres, which he imagines to be live ghosts, because he has a dazzled vision. Reason and understanding forsake him; the spirit of darkness possesses him, intoxicates him, and he fights with an imaginary army of wind-mills. Never did a mirage more effectually blind a thirsty traveler, or a simoon more totally shut in a weary pilgrim, than does the gloom of superstition cloud the victim. It is a thing of night.

Addison, of the *Spectator*, speaks so *apropos* of visions, magic spells, prodigies, etc., that we must give him a place just here:—"In the midst of my musings, my hostess desired me to reach her a little salt upon the point of my knife, which I did in such a trepidation and hurry of obedience, that I let it drop by the way; at which she immediately startled, and said it fell towards her. * * * The lady, however recovered herself, and, after a little space, said to her husband, with a sigh, "My dear, misfortunes never come single. * * * Do you not remember that the pigeon-house fell the very afternoon that our careless servant spilt the salt upon the table?" The husband answered: "Yes, my dear; and the next post brought us an account of the battle of Almanza."

Hereupon he joins a fine peroration, in these words: "I know but one way of fortifying my soul against these gloomy presages and terrors of mind, and that is by securing to myself the friendship and protection of that Being who disposes of events, and governs futurity. He sees, at one view, the whole thread of my existence; not only that part of it which I have already passed through, but that which runs forward into all the depths of eternity. When I lay me down to sleep, I recommend myself to His care; when I awake I give myself up to His direction. Amidst all the evils that threaten me, I will look to Him for help, and question not but He will either avert them or turn them to my advantage. Though I know neither the time nor the manner of the death I am to die, I am not all solicitous about it; because I am sure He knows them both, and that He will not fail to comfort and support me under them."

Faith and Superstition rest severally on different bases.

Faith builds on Truth. Truth as embodied in Revelation is its sure and stable corner-stone. "The word of the Lord abideth forever." As our Gold and Silver Coins, our Bank Notes and Legal Tenders obtain their worth from being grounded in State and National Constitutions, so Faith is fact, rather than fable, because it roots in the body of Divine Truth —the Constitution of God and Heaven, if you please. Carry our monies to Europe, or to any foreign realm, where our laws are without force, and they change their character largely; yea, oftentimes lose their value entirely. But, to remove God's Word from under our creed, is to render it vain, no less. The Rock of Ages alone gives it stability. But the fabric of superstition—on what does it stay itself? On the vain imagination of men, or upon the falsity of Satan. How airy and delusive is such a basis! Three little sprigs of last year's growth, and towards the rising sun, joined to a few silly words and empty signs, will staunch the tide of blood which flows from a gaping wound. A break in the mirror argues a funeral in the family. Friday is an unlucky day to enter on a journey, to move a household. or to solemnize a marriage. The neigh of a horse in a grave-yard procession, is somebody's death-knell. The seventh son is gifted with a wonder-curing power. A score of such notions might be supplemented, were it asked or needed. A laughable rosary, indeed. But it is to the *ground-work* to such prerogatives that we would direct attention. This is as uncertain as the twittering of birds or the chattering of apes, or, worse than that, as deceptive as the Devil. Compare the foundation on which the Sacraments and means of grace are made to stand, with such a basis, and the difference is apparent.

> How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
> Is laid for your Faith in His excellent Word!

Faith lays hold on Truth; Superstition but glances by it.

Gold is pure throughout, and genuine from centre to surface. In appearance, weight and value it bears inspection, examination and scrutiny. All bad money, however, aims at a fair and faithful appearance only. In exterior resemblance alone is it one with the pure element.

Faith is genuine gold, precious through and through. Superstition wears a mask, and cares only to look the thing. The woodman's axe is but dull iron, save a blue line of steel that is welded on the outer edge. Thus is superstition a lie, with some slight covering of truth pasted on and over. Let us illustrate: The cleaning of a wound is of itself healing. But surely it matters little whether you employ three or a dozen instruments; whether you cut the scions from an old or young branch, or use but splinters. Fresh, live coals of well-seasoned hickory wood, are a happy relief in neuralgic pains, on the principle—*similia similibus curanter*—perhaps. But talismanic words, the sacred name of the Trinity, the storing of them away in chimney-corners, and a professional pow-wower—all this constitutes the deceptive baggage. Magnetic rings are not wholly devoid of virtue. We may admit of a sympathy between steel and nerve. But, is it true, that they are only operative when forged from the stray horse-shoe, which you chance to find, with all the eight nails still clinging to it? There are such states as magnetism, clairvoyance and somnambulism, as well as unhappy characters gifted (fated?) therein. But does the abnormal condition generate a medicinal knowledge, intuitively as it were, and to such a marvelous degree as to enable the medium to outrank the physician?

In some such proportion we invariably find the real and the sham to exist as ingredients throughout the whole domain of superstition. An absolute lie has no legs, and cannot stand erect for a single moment. Untruth, in order to succeed even for a spell, must consequently embody some portion of truth, to serve as a staff for itself to lean upon. But all the more blindfolding is it, in the degree it apes the truth. The livery of light enables Satan to do the most execution.

Faith is an Original; Superstition a Degeneration.

Gold and pure currency were prior to all counterfeits. Wheat had been before tares. These are but results breeded under the curse which fell upon the universe after the fall of its lord. The process of degeneration set in just then, and is yet in force all over and all through creation. In like manner was Faith first in order, and superstition is a fearful deformity. Much that is styled "development," is in reality a dev*i*lopment. Cast the pure seed into mire and swamp-soil, if the weather prove unpropitious and the farmer a sluggard, and you will see a poor, blurred copy of your seed-corn. Even so may Faith, be it never so pure, genuine and orthodox, when deposited in the corrupt heart of man, and suffered to lie uncultivated—

fruit in rank superstition. In the lowest stages of civilization and culture, you find its ripest harvest. All heathendom proves our position. Wild land and the public "commons" afford battalions of mullen-stalks. Not so the well-tilled farm. The weakest minds are, at the same time most inclined to a degeneration in Faith. "Necromancy is as old as the witch of Endor. The Bible does not deny the fact as all fiction and fancy; but affirms it and prohibits the practice—not as wholly idle, but as injurious, rather. No revelation treats sorcery, divination, consultations with the dead and witchcraft as humbugs. All its premises are based on the reality of just such phenomena. Revelation commissions spirits, answers apparitions and endorses invocations. It deals in signs and wonders largely. It assumes and concedes the truth and reality of such a system or order. This much authority even superstition may claim." It is proving entirely too much for any man of faith to ignore the realm of wonders as something baseless and unreal.

"But then soothsayers, sorcerers and necromancers must take the prohibition along with the concession. The concession is made, but the prohibition as well. The Egyptians imitated Moses most closely. Beelzebub has the credit of exorcising demons, no less than the Son of God. Jesus bestowed the miracle-working power on His agents, but warned them that false prophets should arise and show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they should deceive the very elect. St. Paul speaks of that 'wicked one whose coming is after the power of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of truth. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.' The Gods celestial and the Gods infernal of the Pagan world correspond to these good and evil agents of our own system; and the universal agreement of all times and countries concerning such antagonisms between 'Michael and his angels, and the Dragon and his angels' is not to be disposed of (without the total denial of both) save as we acknowledge the order of superstition to have a real foundation, in so far as we even hold it to be a degeneration of an original Faith.' "—(*Elder.*)

So we dispose of "spirit rappings," "ghosts," and many other wonderments. We believe them to be spurious, but real imitations under the manipulation of a real devil. Barring all that common sense and science can account for, there is still enough left for us to stand to our theory. Hence the warnings against having any communion with the works of darkness. Were they mere nothings Holy Writ would hardly dwell so seriously over them.

It is permitted to all men to stand neutral in some opinions without engaging their assent to one side or the other. Such a hovering mind, which refuses to settle upon any determination, is absolutely necessary in his case who would be careful to avoid errors and prepossessions. The arguments may press equally hard on both sides. The safest method is to give over to neither, uncomfortable as the position may be. In such a relation many minds stand to Witchcraft, for example. We have reports in favor of its realness from all parts and during all times. How can we then forbear thinking that there is such an intercourse and commerce with the other world? But on the other hand, we are reminded of the fact, that the ignorant and the credulous abound most in such relations, and that they who deal in such commerce are of weak minds and crazed imaginations. The mind consequently divides between the two opposite opinions. We speak for ourselves, however, and stand to our view in Necromancy. It is not necessary nor timely to enter into details any further, on the subject, than simply to call attention to the strong prohibitions against indulging in such commerce, as an evidence already of its reality.

Faith is a rarity; Superstition abounds.

"All men have not faith"—in exercise and life, we suppose. "When the Son of man cometh will He find faith on the earth?" Gold is precious because of its scarcity. But gilt chains, and rings, and pins, and washed chronometers glitter amazingly.

The evidences of a popular superstition are to be discerned at every turn. Men and communities ride their pet "hobbies." Few are invulnerable against its shafts. Yankees and Pennsylvania Dutchmen ; clergymen at the head of their flocks ; in a word, the populace are given over to its spirit, however slowly their confession may come. New England is supposed to have been the exclusive quarter wherein witches abounded. The Colonial Records of Pennsylvania, however, now lying open before us, show a number of like cases of sufficient importance to engage the attention of grave Legislators.

From a standard work of the last century we give parts of a page of its history :—" I hear that there is scarcely a village in England that has not a Moll White in it. When an aged woman begins to dote, or grow a beneficiary to a Parish, she is generally spotted a witch, and fills the whole country with extravagant fancies, imaginary distempers, and terrifying dreams. If she chanced to stumble, the folks always found the sticks, straws, etc., to lay in the form of a cross thereabout. Not a girl in the region that would take a pin from her, though a bag of gold were given with it. If the dairy-maid does not make her butter come so soon as she would have it, Moll White is at the bottom of the churn. If a horse sweats in the stable, or a hare makes an unexpected escape from the hounds, Moll White is invariably cursed."

True, they transpired over one hundred years ago ; but even that lapse of time is no guarantee of its abolition. Mankind will in all ages believe something. Our times are no exception to the universal rule. And as we dare not style the nineteenth century an " age of Faith," you may be sure that the channels of superstition are in no wise closed. I am sure, sad as is the necessity of confessing it that children are hastily christened, in not a few instances, more to ease their fretfulness than for their regeneration. There are hearts wicked enough to swallow the emblems of the Lord's supper more in superstition than in Faith.

Faith ennobles ; Superstition degrades.

We do not mean to repeat what has already been said under our first head, though it will necessarily betray a kinship. The man of Faith is equipped and elevated, and thereby becomes strong and heroic. He conquers earth and the world, death and hell. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our Faith." In the XI. chapter of the Letter to the Hebrews, you are made to walk, as it were, through a long gallery of Heroes, grander than the Pantheon.

Superstition, on the other hand, unmans the mind. It is as when big men would play with dolls. All intercourse and contact with such a bastard creed proves harmful, because it conducts from the truth, and truth alone is powerful. Satan is the "father of lies," and all communication with falsehood corrupts and enfeebles. Hence the use of omens is interdicted. "Witchcrafts shall be cut off;" "soothsayers shall be banished;" "children must not be conducted through fire;" "the flight of birds is not to be interpreted;" pow-wowing is to be cut up by the roots. But why? Because any and every such touching the "black-arts" is ruinous to mankind. It is not too much to say that it degrades enough to damn. We are afraid of all plyers of the trade. The ugliest women in the land are the professional "Brouchers!" They are cousin-german to the witches and "Zeeigners."

What a terrible mental state it is, in which we believe a lie! And yet not a few have fallen into or border on it. In every large city and town, as well as rural district, your "artists" thrive over a business that never languishes for want of credulous customers. The encamping Gypsies gather a fortune in our groves and on the edges of populous places. The fanaticism enfeebles men and women, and renders them impotent, like the fabled serpent that charms and swallows the unresisting victim." "O ye Athenians, I perceive that ye are in all things too superstitious," St. Paul thought it worth while to say. There is reason to continue the exclamation. "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" he asked, and still asks. If our position be well founded, that superstition is a degenerate faith, its tendency and effects must ever prove degrading to the race. Heathenism shows us some of its ripest fruit. Idolatry, and every false system of religion, is but an elongation of the order. "Touch not, taste not, handle not," does not apply to the use of strong drink, as is widely supposed and proclaimed. It is precisely aimed against a silly credulity in the use or disuse of meats and drink, in holy days and new moons, in whatever falls within the domain of superstition, as we find it manifesting itself in the almost splendid sins of Paganism, or in laughable but fascinating structures in Christendom. Not the "papist," but the *apist* is aimed at throughout, as the degenerator and adulterator of "the Faith once delivered to the saints." Such a system maintained alongside of one's Faith, will prove a sad leveler to the means of grace. It is no longer in the "prayers of the Elders" that such tainted souls confide, or in their anointing with oil; but in the talismanic sayings and doings of the magician. Not the odor of sanctity, it seems, but the breath of some necromancer, is what is so sanitary. We could tell of one who entered the chamber of a sick child, from which a woman with a "familiar spirit" had just emerged, and left back a smell of charcoal and brimstone, which reminded him—not of *good* angels. He could hardly get rid of a prayer there; and if that, still no mighty work was done, because of the family's unbelief. The pow-wower, no less than the copper-smith, is doing the kingdom of God much harm. They are the Simon Magus and the Alexander of old, still tracking the Simon Peter and the Paul of to-day.

Faith aims at man's highest good; Superstition at the baser ends.

The restoration of bodily health; the recovery of stolen goods; how to form a happy marriage-union; how to secure good luck—your *luck* in time—these are the chief ends in magic. But the lost soul—of what concern is that?

The man of Faith sees greater evils than death. "Death, where is thy sting?" is a triumphant song on his lips. Death and the grave constitute the sum of all evils to an enchanted soul. Time is above eternity; earth higher than heaven; the life that now is, better than that which is to come; the body of more account than the soul; health and wealth outweigh salvation. His whole gospel is of a timely, fleshy and perishing kind. The evangelization of the world, the salvation of mankind, and eternal life, your magicians who compass sea and land, dream not of. How little can such a dazzled spirit see the sense of such words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

Faith knows only God's supreme will; Superstition is selfishness.

The language of a normal Faith runs in such Formulas: "Not my will, but Thine be done." "Thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven." Reverse it, and we have the utterances of an abnormal and rank order. There is no account made of the Divine decree. Selfishness reigns supreme. How vastly different are the prayers of such oppositely set hearts. A fond parent, of the better mind, moves in a circle that is beautifully rounded. Hear him: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." Such cries go up to God, let us say, from the couches of sick and dying children, perhaps daily. None but such spirits as are made strong through an heroic faith can utter them. But let the issue be as it may, the suppliant is the victor.

Men of the baser order of credence, however, startle us by their heaven-daring spirit. "Who is the Lord, that I should fear Him? Let not my child die! Save it from death's embrace, regardless of any and every ordering from above!"

Now we humbly submit that men, women and children had better die *Deo volente*, than be restored and rescued from the grave and dissolution, contrary to His will. Death a thousand times rather, in accordance with our Heavenly Father's mind, than life by the art and forbidden power of the necromancer, be that life never so long and never so sweet.

Let one incident illustrate our meaning:—We once knelt and wrestled with God over a little boy, in the last stages of diphtheria. We conditioned our supplications by such *provisos* as God's Law sets for short-sighted mortals. But that did not satisfy the stricken and blinded household. A wizard was sent for, four miles away. He came; he tore the mollifying wrappings aside, and breathed (we know not what) into the tender throat of the little sufferer—never asking whether God might not perhaps want that child for His "*Kinder-Garten*" beyond. And the contest went on for one full week, between God's prophet and Baal's before the lot fell. But when it had fallen, we found that He had done as *we* had prayed—as it pleased Him. And it pleased Him to call the child home.

A faith that seeks not, first of all, the kingdom of God and His righteousness, is a fraud. If there be no other criterion, this single one is already amply sufficient to guard and guide us. Be there a virtue in unlawful manipulations or not, it is a forbidden art, and consequently wrong.

Faith is reasonable; Superstition unreasonable as well as Unscriptural and Unchristian.

There is point and relevancy touching all Christian doctrine, in the precept: "And be ye ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." And here let us join a series of sayings quite *apropos*:—"Neither give heed to fables." "But refuse profane and old wives' fables. For the time will come when they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." Then an Apostle rises indignantly above the charge of having endorsed similar inventions, and exclaims—"For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty." Evidently Christian dogmas lie wholly on a separate plane. The Gospel is not unreasonable in its pretensions, challenges and claims. All truth is reasonable, in its last ground, however mysterious a theory or fact may strike us in its manifestation. Whatever philosophy embraces, reason will sooner or later scent, track and unravel. A why and a wherefore stand in waiting for every discovered truth. All is not superstitious that is mysterious. A naturalist will ask us to plant a post, or roof a house during the waning of the moon, for the reason that the planet affects the sea, the earth, and all that is therein. Lunar influences have been defended by Pliny, by Galen, and many modern scientists. Neither is all superstition that is popular. The masses often speak an unknown tongue, which the few only can interpret. So long therefore as reason and revelation do not protest, we are not yet within forbidden territory. But whenever they raise their united hands, we seem to hear the *caveat*—"Avaunt!"

What are we to say to the claims of Medical Science, of the Profession and its schools, in all civilized countries, if an ignorant sorcerer or "knower of the black arts" can excel its disciples in knowledge and practice? A surgeon will staunch a flow of blood by resorting to compression, in case coagulation does not ensue. He of the "secret art," however, reposes all virtue in his cabalistic sayings and doings. Whom are we then to believe? An ancient record advises us in these words: "Honor the physician for the need thou hast of him; for the Most High hath created him. For all healing is from God; and he shall receive gifts of the king. The skill of the physician shall lift up his head; and in the sight of great men he shall be praised. The Most High hath created medicines out of the earth, and a wise man will not abhor him." (*Ecclesiasticus*, xxxviii. 1–4.) There is verily a small margin allowed, then, for the practice of sorcery. Unless we take the ground that the power of doing wonders has become common, yea the prerogative of every pretender, reason and common sense would unite their verdict with that of the Gospel, and condemn all superstitious arts.

Even so, too, must the office of the Christian ministry become an idle order, no less than the physician's art, unless we pronounce against our bastard "science." A genuine Christianity and an orthodox Faith bespeak for the ordinances whose functions are discharged, one who is called, chosen and ordained. Sacraments and sacramental acts seem to fall to the lot of such as are especially appointed thereto. Grace has worn for itself peculiar channels, through which it approaches men's hearts. The "ascending and descending of angels," it appears, is even yet possible on Jacob's ladder.

But if superstitious arts are well grounded, then the ministry is a myth, and should be set aside. The common highway is now the way of the spirit, and every man a "medium." Incantations have supplanted invocations, and a "universal priesthood" has indeed set in.

And now, though every position taken throughout these pages prove untenable, we can nevertheless in no wise surrender our views. If no other help remains for us, we will fall back on the precedent set for us by Saint Peter, who did not stop long to inquire whether there was any reality in the sorcery of Simon Magus or not, but condemned him unconditionally. That he practiced it was sufficient cause to draw a curse upon himself. It was *ipso facto* wrong.

Finally. That man is a religious being is proven by his Faith, normal and abnormal. That there is room left in his constitution for the organ of Trust, whether its exercise prove of a natural or monstrous kind, is a striking commentary on his religiosity. The plant, bird or beast have no such provision made for an element or instinct of this order. The human mind alone is thus capacitated and equipped.

But the use of anything implies, at the same time, also the possibility of abuse. The imitation, however, is always a good argument for an original. The sham prophesies, against its will, for the true. A principle that cannot be run aground will never aim at the stars or shoot at the sun, either. It may not be forgotten that the Son of God even is set for the rising *and* falling of many. To rail at Faith, because of the monster, superstition, would indeed be to *wer das kind mit dem Bath hinaus.*

The question—How is Christian Society to free its members from the pressure of superstition?—is a moral question, and consequently of interest. We have, however, no specific to offer. To set virtue aloft in order that she may preach her homily against vice, seems to be the old and best *modus operandi* in every matter of reform. Accordingly, a genuine Christian faith proves the surest protection against its counterfeit. Let it be counted 'precious' as Holy Writ holds it. Let it be set forth in the social market as the gold of heaven. Help man to secure and retain it. Who will crave the dross afterwards? Fill the bushel measure with wheat, and where is there room any longer for chaff. It is the scarcity of good money that breeds counterfeits. The man whose pockets are filled with the legal coins, surely craves not the bad notes to boot. He has neither heart nor need for them. And who that holds the faith that renders contrite; that reforms; that opens the heart to the Holy Ghost; that sanctifies; that removes mountains of sin; that cleanses from all iniquity: that overcomes death, the grave and hell; who that has a full measure of such faith, would still long after a forbidden and poisonous order? The minds who make least real account of Sacraments are most pliant under the wand of the magician. Where grace is not asked and sought for, there magic will be. Baptismal water may run very low; but how strange that the waters of certain fabled springs should be so omnipotent then. The Blood of the Lamb, we are profanely told, is in no way a healing, cleansing element. But the blood of certain odd animals are most efficacious, they then say. A man in orders is as a puppet to many; to whom, however, a 'pretender' seems almost sacred. Caligula was an atheist under a clear sky, while under a passing thunder-cloud he proved very cowardly. Voltaire would not allow his 'chums' to talk up the No-God theory before his menials. The circles during the 'spirit-rapping' *mania* are most largely filled by those whom the Holy Spirit troubles least. We cannot but see, then, that a good supply of faith is of itself a shield against its rival. The three cardinal virtues to a beautiful and perfect character—Faith, Hope, Charity,—are indeed a grand reservoir of supplies in all respects to man. If once placed in proper relation thereto, and rightly connected therewith, his every want can be satisfied; and besides this, he is endowed with what we may call a divine instinct, by virtue of which he may at once discriminate between the genuine and the spurious. He is beyond the blighting influence of all evil, if not in such a way as not to be touched by it, then yet so fortified as not to be harmed by it. Yea, faith is verily an antidote to superstition. [Earnest minds are seriously asking themselves, whether ours is not an age of unbelief, and are without ceasing engaged in uttering the only cry of relief—"*Lord we believe; help Thou our unbelief!*"]

As all reformation proceeds from above downwards, it behooves all such as have obtained light to 'strengthen their brethren.' And what more delightful for man to be engaged in, then to spend and to be spent in conducting man away from the blinding glare of a "Jack O' Lantern" to Him who is the Light of Life?

ART. III.—THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY REV. SAMUEL MILLER, PHILADELPHIA.

THE question: What is the Holy Catholic Church and how are we members of it? refers to its ideal and at the same time most real and fundamental ground, Christ Jesus, the living head of his living members, both in heaven and earth.

The Christian consciousness has no difficulty in confessing this article of the Creed, and has confessed it accordingly in all ages of the Church, however impossible it may be to explain its mystery to our rational comprehension. Our faith in the case rests on our personal relation to Christ, who, by the gift and grace of His Holy Spirit has joined us to Him as our living head. This is the ground of our faith, and the best of reasons we can give for it.

Others may assign a less substantial reason, and profess to believe in the Holy Catholic Church and to be members of it, because they are members of the Roman, the Episcopal, the Lutheran, the Reformed or some other empirical Church. But the Creed does not make *them* an object and article of faith. We cannot believe in them in the sense in which we believe in the Holy Catholic Church. They are not identical. To be members of any of them does not necessarily imply that we are members of the Holy Catholic Church. It may be presumed that we are, but not inferred, and the presumption, to be of any account, must be sustained by our personal relation to Christ. The real identity in the case consists in this, that being members of Christ, our living head, we are members of the Holy Catholic Church. We may not be able to explain the mystery in the case, but the facts, and our faith, remain the same nevertheless.

But we *can* understand, that this does not logically imply, that Christ and His members are identical, however mystically and divinely joined together;—that He as head, and His body are the same;—and per consequence, that His body and the Holy Catholic Church are the same. This would make it identical with the actual, historical and empirical Church; which is in process of actualizing it as its underlying ideal; but not the Holy Catholic Church itself. These distinctions are not always made with sufficient care, which leads to a confusion of ideas and misapprehensions, involving consequences of great importance.

The Creed does not make the members of the Holy Catholic Church, but the Holy Catholic Church of which they are the members, an object and article of faith. They are for our faith and believing thinking clearly distinct. However intimately the vine and its branches are related, they are nevertheless distinct. When Christ represents Himself as the ground and essential being of the Church under the similitude of the true vine, He clearly distinguishes Himself from His disciples as members of the Church. "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Paul makes the same distinction when he represents Christ as the Head of the Church, in distinction to its body of members. The same idea is brought out more fully by the frequent representation of the Church as the family of God, (the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named) and Jerusalem above, (the Church in its divine and heavenly constitution), as the mother of us all.

The principal and controlling idea in the conception of the Family, are the parents. They constitute the family as a real unit, and complete in itself, before an actual family of children cluster around them. This is true in reference to the human family as a whole no less than of every particular family it includes. The family as parents and the family as children, however closely related and constituting a unit, are clearly distinct. They represent the Church as it holds primarily in the person and fullness of Christ, manifested in the flesh; and secondarily as it flows over historically and is perpetually present and forming a unit with the body of His living members. The one is perfect and complete in itself, and fully answers to the idea of the "Holy Catholic Church." The other falls short of it, on account of its natural and human imperfections and moral impurities still clinging to its membership and to every thing human connected with it. Even in man himself there is a higher and a lower—a mental and a physical constitution, which are clearly distinct, however intimately soul and body are united. To deny that they are distinct entities, is to deny the immortality of the soul, and the same materialistic consequences are involved in denying the distinction between the divine and the human constitution of the Church.

The Church, in its higher constitution, is divine and supernatural. In its lower constitution, it is human and natural. In the one we have the Holy Catholic Church, with which we are united as living members. United with us, its living members, we have the actual historical Church in the process of realizing subjectively its objective divine and supernatural idea. "Abide in me, and I in you." Our abiding in Him implies our union with Him and our relation as members of the Holy Catholic Church as an objective divine and supernatural constitution. His abiding in us implies His union with us and our relation as integrant parts of the actual historical Church.

It is accordingly a mistaken view, when the idea of the Holy Catholic Church is reduced to what it is historically: or reduced still lower by making the Church consist simply of its ministers and members, whether viewed as a visible organization or an abstract invisible congregation of believers.

To this low view, of sundering the body from its head, it comes at last with all the high and low Church views, that cannot rise above the conception of its human and natural constitution, whether with or without a human pope at its head; and notwithstanding its supernaturalistic rationalism on the one hand, and its rationalistic supernaturalism on the other.

High Church and Low Church—whether Romanism and Puritanism, or high and low church Episcopalianism—are in such view found to stand on the same plane, with their backs up against each other, but really occupying substantially the same position in agreeing that the Church consists simply of its ministers and members; thus sundering it from its true and living head and denying its divine and supernatural constitution. The one tries to make good its superior claims, as against the other, by referring to its outward historical connection with early Christianity; the other, by professing to go back to its purity and simplicity.

Going back to early Christianity, if we go back far enough and do not stop short of the incarnate Word, instead of simply the written word, is certainly better than merely *referring* back to it by an unbroken chain of outward succession, which leaves it problematical whether there is any inward connection and resemblance between them. It is known what estimate the Saviour placed on such outward succession on the part of those who claimed Abraham as their father, and what resemblance remained at the end of the unbroken chain between the father of the faithful, and them—whose father turned out to be a very different sort of a father. But aside of this, the Church is viewed in either case as consisting simply of a body of ministers and members. The living head of the Church, of which they are or may be supposed to be the living members, is, in such view, entirely lost sight of, instead of being made the principal and controlling idea of the Church and the bond of spiritual unity that binds it together as a community of saints. We can conceive a mechanical connection of the parts of a mechanism, and a moral connection between men who agree on any moral or religious subject; but we cannot conceive the organic connection of the branches, except in connection with the true vine, of which they are the living branches. The communion of saints is absolutely conditioned by their living union and communion with Christ, their living head. We believe in the communion of saints, not because they constitute the Holy Catholic Church, but because they are members of the Holy Catholic Church, and there can be no communion of saints outside of it. We have true Christian fellowship and sympathy one with another, and are an actual living and spiritually growing Church because we are in true fellowship and sympathy with Christ, our spiritual head.

We have thus two distinct ideas in the conception of the Christian Church, which are neither to be separated, nor held as identical. The conception is clearly and forcibly expressed by the Saviour Himself, when He says: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." John xiv. 4. Christ's presence in us, and the possibility of our bringing forth fruit, is here absolutely conditioned by our abiding in Him. There can be no Christians and no actual Christian Church out of Christ, the true vine and living head of the Church. Sundered from Him, by resolving the Church simply into ministers and members, men may still plant themselves on St. Peter, or on the Bible, or on some other rock; and meet to chant hymns, or sing psalms, or exalt Episcopal succession, or raise Luther to the skies, or glorify Methodism, and profess to be Christian Churches, when they are nothing of the kind, (if their own theory of the Church is to decide the question). Alas! this falling away from Christ, does not merely exist in wrong views concerning Christ and the Church, but is becoming more and more a mournful reality. Sundered from Christ, men may still pretend to be Christians, and Christian Churches, under any disguise that will best cover the deception, and are capable of carrying it to any extent, even to the violent suppression of the truth and the persecution of the Church of God.

But the same bad results must follow if we identify the divine and human, the supernatural and natural constitution of the Church; for this is substantially the same thing as to separate them. They are and must be for our faith and believing thinking, most intimately united; but at the same time as clearly distinct.

In Christ, its divine head, the Church is an ideal and at the same time most real, divine, supernatural constitution, the One Holy Catholic Church. In its human membership, it is an actual, historical, growing, fruit-bearing, but imperfect Church. They mutually penetrate each other—ye in me, and I in you—and this mutual penetration constitutes them a unit. The one forms the fundamental ground and life principle of the other, on which it depends for its existence and fruitful development. The ideal Church could not actualize itself and bear fruit in the world, except in and through the actual Church; and the actual Church could not exist and live and bear fruit without the ideal Church—just as the vine cannot bear fruit without the branches, and the branches cannot bear fruit except they abide in the vine. They are thus most intimately united; but not identical, nor co-ordinate—for this we know is far from being the case even with respect to the divinity and humanity of Christ—nor even in the order of nature with respect to the psychical and physical constitution of man.

The actual historical Church is not the Holy Catholic Church. She is such only in Christ Jesus, her underlying idea and principle. The actual Church is still subject to internal and external divisions, impurities and limitations, notwithstanding and in contradiction to her ideal and principle. In this contradiction between her ideal, and her actual condition, consists her shortcoming, her imperfection, and the cause of many of her trials and troubles. It is besides a stone of stumbling and a cause of sore reproach, which all are made to feel who take an interest in her spiritual welfare, and are laboring to build her up and extend her borders.

This condition of things in the actual Church is very perplexing to many professed Christians. They cannot reconcile it with the Apostles' Creed, and are ready to expunge from that ancient Symbol as obsolete the article of faith in the Holy Catholic Church—because they cannot say, lo! here, lo! there it is. As if the kingdom of Heaven must needs come by outward observation. But as long as there are true believers in the world, who are conscious of being living members of Christ, their living head, so long will faith in the Holy Catholic Church continue, and be heartily confessed. And so long will there be an actual historical Church, which Christ has purchased with His blood, endowed with His Holy Spirit and with which He promised to be alway, even to the end of the world, and against which even the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Faith in the Holy Catholic Church does not come by empirical observation, and never did. It rests on our personal relation to Christ, who by the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit has joined us to Him as our living head. This is the ground of our faith, which does not rest on the condition of things in the actual empirical Church; and cannot, therefore, be shaken by it.

It is true, the Church manifests itself in the world, through its organization, which becomes an object of empirical observation, or a visible Church. As such it exists in various forms, as so many distinct branches of the Church, each branch comprehending a larger or smaller number of subdivided branches of single congregations and members. This we say, is an object of empirical observation, but not an object of faith. There is no mystery in it to challenge our faith. It is comprehended by the plainest common sense. But for that very reason there is no deeper meaning and mystery to be attached to it, by any superstitious or magical associations which men may still connect with it. It is only when we are confronted with the divine and supernatural mysteries involved in the Church, that our faith is challenged and called into exercise. But there is no mystery involved in any one being a Roman Catholic, though priest, bishop or pope he may be; nor in being an Episcopalian, a Lutheran, a Presbyterian, a Methodist, or Baptist. The mystery consists in any of them being at the same time members of Christ. This can only be known even to themselves first of all by the true and living faith, that unites them to Christ; and not by any empirical observation. All of these churches might be reconstructed, reorganized, renamed, reunited and resubdivided, without affecting their relation to Christ one way or the other. All the mutations through which the Church has thus passed or may pass hereafter in her empirical constitution, do not affect or change her divine and supernatural constitution; which from beginning to end remains the one Holy Catholic Church, challenging our implicit faith, whether we can square them on rational principles or not. Faith does not require this; and reason cannot do it. The supernatural here as elsewhere, immeasurably transcends the natural, and cannot be measured and covered by this. As the heavens are higher than the earth, so is the idea of the divine and supernatural order and constitution of the Church higher than that of her natural and empirical constitution, "for my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." Is. lv. 8. The higher Church with its high-priest "is made higher than the heavens," Heb. vii. 26, and embraces "the whole family in heaven and earth." Eph. iii. 15.

To make this high Church view square with what the Church is in her natural, organized and empirical order and constitution, under any form, is to destroy the very idea of the Holy Catholic Church, and to convert all *mystery* besides into *magic* and *faith* into *superstition*. A sound and healthful view of the Church, the Ministry, the Word and Sacraments, must rid itself entirely of this magic and superstition—not for the purpose of divesting them of their mystery, but in order that their divine and supernatural mystery may become all the more really an object of faith, and their true design and purpose be properly apprehended.

But neither will faith in the Holy Catholic Church allow and justify any reason for discontented parties to set at naught even the least and humblest branch of the Church, by disregarding its legitimate authority, or tearing loose from it in a disorderly and unfriendly manner. No such conduct and divisions of the Church can have place without doing violence to the Spirit, that unites us to Christ. We cannot thus tear ourselves loose from our brethren, without tearing ourselves loose from Christ Himself. This is not taking back what we have just said in regard to the empirical Church. That Church, with its manifold branches, is not the Holy Catholic Church ;—but in virtue of their mystical union with Christ, they are branches and members of it. To tear loose from the branch, to which we belong, is, accordingly, to tear loose from the vine. Just in this precisely, lies the deep and profound mystery, which underlies the visible, empirical Church, and in which we are bound to believe. "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me," we hear the Saviour say, "it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were drowned in the depths of the sea." Mat. xviii. 6.

We are not of course simply to assume and take for granted, that the different denominations and organizations of professed Christians, are true branches of the Holy Catholic Church. *That depends upon whether they bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.*

The branch, no less than the tree, is known by its fruit. The unmistakable evidence of *the fruits of the Holy Spirit* in any body of Christians, is a vindication of their claim to recognition as a branch of the Christian Church. They are in truth the only credentials that bear the Divine signature! They are the manifestations of the divine and supernatural presence and power in the Church, which works in them and brings forth in them the fruits of righteousness to the glory of God the Father. "For herein," says the Saviour, "is my Father glorified, that ye bring forth much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.' On the contrary: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away, it is cast forth as a branch, and is withered.'

Nothing but pride and spiritual blindness, which has no apprehension of the divine and supernatural Life and Spirit of the Christian Church, can fail to apprehend what these profound and deeply solemn words of the Saviour mean. Tried by their fruits, the different branches and sections of the Christian Church have little reason to boast and exalt themselves above each other, but show abundant cause why their heavenly Father the husbandman, should apply the pruning knife, and purge them, that they may bring forth more fruit. Let each look to itself, so that when the time of pruning comes, it may not be found among the branches that are taken away and cast forth to wither and die.—Even the whole Gentile Christian portion of the Church, is solemnly warned against such a fate. "Boast not against the branches. Thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches (the Jews), take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God; on them which fell, severity; but towards thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also if they abide not in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again." Rom. xi. 18–23. Well may the Apostle exclaim, in view of such facts and contingencies: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out."

What the Christian consciousness needs in our day, is to apprehend more clearly and distinctly on what its faith in the Holy Catholic Church rests; and to guard itself against the natural tendency of the human mind to identify it in one way or the other with the empirical Church, which is not an object of supernatural faith at all; but is subject to being dissected and analyzed by the Reason, just like anything else that falls within its reach. There is always a tendency in the human Reason, if not firmly held under subjection to Faith, to level the supernatural with the natural: because the reason moves in the sphere of the natural, while the supernatural transcends it, and can only be apprehended by Faith. If the Reason nevertheless tries to grasp and hold the supernatural as distinct from the natural, or in conjunction with it, it is always in a more or less unreal and magical way, which ends in their identification, either by deifying man and worshiping nature; or by transmuting the supernatural into the natural; thus doing away with the former and denying it altogether. Thus it has ever been with natural Reason in regard to God and nature. It is the same in regard to the divine and human nature in the person of Christ; and the same also in regard to the supernatural and natural constitution of the Church, the Word, the Ministry, the Sacraments. There is always in human Reason this natural tendency to transmute in some way the natural and supernatural: either the natural into the supernatural, or the supernatural into the natural. It is only by the power of Faith that they can be held as distinct entities and yet mystically (not magically) joined together. Reason always makes a botch of it and runs it in the ground, when it attempts to explain it.

The two tendencies referred to may, for the purpose we have in view, be called the Romanizing and Rationalizing tendencies. Romanism carried out to its logical consequences, is the transmutation of the natural into the supernatural, a deification of man and a worshiping of nature. Rationalism, carried out to its consequences, is the transmutation of the divine and supernatural into the natural, a rejection of the supernatural altogether. The only way to keep clear of either of these two tendencies is, to stand firmly in the Faith that unites us personally to Christ, our living head.

No other position is safe and secure against their assaults, or against our own natural tendency to fall in with the one or the other. As against that impregnable position, on which the Reformation had planted itself, Romanism has ever proved itself weak, and was forced to give way to a power and a movement stronger and mightier than itself. But against any other position it is a giant in strength, backed as it is by its traditional faith as well as by its superstition and the superstition of its peoples, which it knows how to turn to account as against its own inward rationalizing tendency and its invasion from without. Protestantism becomes weak and is shorn of its real strength, like Samson of old, when it forsakes its true position and falls in with either the Romanizing or Rationalizing tendency of the age—both of which are fighting for the mastery, and the prize, as to which shall bear off the crown of Antichrist.

It is admitted, we believe, that there are two tendencies in the Reformed Church in the United States; and that it is well to allow each of them free scope to develop themselves to their consequences. But we beg leave to inquire, what those two tendencies are, and whither they are drifting. If they are the two tendencies referred to, then we pray God on our bended knees, that he may speedily deliver our Church from both of them, and unite us on the only position that is safe and impregnable against them. That position we have endeavored to point out, as it commends itself to an enlightened Christian consciousness.

Let us understand each other. Where do the two parties in the Reformed Church stand? Do not both insist with equal emphasis on the Faith that unites us personally to Christ, our living head? Is not this the very position for which both are so earnestly contending, only perhaps by different modes of reasoning? Where is there a minister or member of the Reformed Church, who, to-day, is willing to renounce and forsake this position? We confess that we know of none. That all are not equally able to hold their Reason and thinking and way of expressing themselves, under strict subjection to this Faith, which exposes them to just criticism, may be freely admitted. That there are two different modes of thinking in the Reformed Church is undoubtedly true, and if *that* is meant by the two tendencies, we fully agree, that they should both be tolerated, as they must in the end flow together and complete each other. They are the deductive and inductive modes of reasoning, which do not necessarily contradict each other, but rest on the presupposition of the same principle of Faith, on which both parties profess to stand. Sundered from that principle, they of course become dangerous tendencies, such as we have already described, and with which no true believer can have any sympathy. Reason sundered from Faith, is sure to err, and lead into grievous error and wrong, no matter which mode of reasoning it may choose to adopt. It can only end in losing all distinction between the natural and supernatural, the human and divine, by transmuting either the natural into the supernatural, or the supernatural into the natural. The tendencies in these two directions we call the Romanizing and Rationalizing tendencies, against which there is no safety and protection except the Faith that unites us personally to Christ, our living head. The Church that stands in the power of this old and glorious Faith will itself be a power in the world, that will make itself felt in spite of all the opposition that may array itself against it. Let us firmly hold each other to this position, in the spirit of brotherly love, and not compromise it with any tendency that would lead the heart and mind of the Church away from it. Let us come to understand each other on this great and fundamental principle, and be heartily united upon it, and there will be less difficulty to come to an understanding on minor points; or at least to tolerate each other as brethren in Christ, even if we cannot think alike in reference to all the particular points involved in the general discussion.

By what we have said we of course do not mean to intimate, that what has been said and written on either side of our theological discussions, is to be accepted for more than its intrinsic worth. In any free and general discussion there is always on both sides of a question much said that does not bear a critical examination, and had better not been said at all. The truth we all know is often made to suffer at the hands of injudicious and hasty friends, quite as much as by its enemies. This is unfortunate, and to be regretted. But it decides nothing. It does not affect the real merits of the question under general discussion. It is only after long and varied discussion and much patient thinking, guided by the inspiration of an humble and loving Christian faith, that the truth is clearly brought out in reference to any great and important Church questions, such as have engaged the attention of our Church during the years that are past. Nor is it to be presumed that the discussion has as yet reached any conclusions on which we are all fully agreed, except the one we have endeavored to present in this paper, namely, the

Faith that unites us personally to Christ, our living head. If the discussion has resulted in uniting us on this position, then indeed has it been owned and blessed of God beyond our highest expectations. Let that principle govern our thinking, our discussions, and above all our life and actions, and the Great Revival will go on, and God will bless us yet more abundantly as a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church.

ART. IV.—THE FALL AND ITS IMPORT.

BY REV. D. F. BRENDLE, A. M., BETHLEHEM, PA.

IN the beginning of time, nearly six thousand years ago, God created the heavens and the earth, with all that they contain. After the lower order of creation was finished, the Triune God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." "And the Lord God" we are told, "formed man of the dust of the ground," and added the breath of life or lives,* "and man became a living soul." Man, therefore, takes his rise in the breath of God, and may be said to be something divine; "fearfully and wonderfully made," and upon this ground alone was he capable of coming into full and abiding union with God.

The image or likeness in which Adam was formed denotes the nearest resemblance to God, both physically and morally; still the distance between God and man is infinite. Christ only is the express image of God's person, as the Son of the Father, having one and the same nature with the Father. This "image of God," in which Adam was made consisted "in righteousness and true holiness." He was not created perfect, but perfectible. He was thus made, "that he might rightly know God His Creator, heartily love Him, and live with Him in eternal happiness to glorify and praise Him." Man in his natural state was created, neither mortal nor immortal, but rather in a state of moral *equilibrio*, capable of becoming, either mortal or immortal, according as he would exercise his own free will and choice. He was potentially capable of becoming mortal or immortal. With us there is no possibility of reaching immortality. We get it from Christ. With Adam it was different; he could by the proper exercise of his own free will, raise himself into a higher sphere of holiness, or he could reduce himself to the lowest grade of misery. "Adam in the first moment of his creation was endowed with the power of will, in a state of positive determination in reference to the good, or to God and His law. And yet that will, which was substantially good from the beginning, was required to determine *itself* also in reference to God's will or law, and thus to be good by its own choice. What Adam was substantially from the beginning, that he was required subsequently to make himself by a conscious act of his own freedom." In order to give him a fair trial of exercising his own free will, two trees were in the garden, the "Tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and the "Tree of Life." These trees were both of a sacramental character. If Adam had resisted the temptation, and overcome his own selfishness, he afterwards by the use of the tree of life, as the medium, would have risen to higher glory and beatitude, because holiness is the product of the creature putting forth an action of its own, however much this may be assisted by God. His yielding to temptation was not brought about by a want of ability on his part to resist it, "or because God, for some wise purpose deprived him again of his original righteousness, but it was brought about by the instigation of the devil and his own willful disobedience;" and consequently God withdrew His presence, and the curse and destruction came justly upon him and the race, which he carried in himself.

---

* Meaning the man in his totality as a living soul.

We are not to understand that this immortality, which was within Adam's reach, was inherent in the tree itself, as such, but the gift of immortality was suspended on the proper use of it. It was the medium through which immortality was to be conferred upon Adam. This immortality was to pass over into Adam through the proper use of the "tree of life," as the medium, the same as the life of Christ now is made to pass over to man by the operation of the Holy Ghost, through the Church as the medium. So on the other hand, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil stood in that same relation in an opposite way, and was the medium through which he would come to a proper consciousness of good and evil, in an experimental way. It was the medium through which sin from the devil in hell, would pass over and poison the very nature and essence of man. The tree was the occasion or condition by which Adam was to be brought to the sense of his own will and the will of God in the way of *Law.* Here for the first time the Law of God meets him. Here is the test where the point is to be settled, whether he will obey God, or his own selfish nature,which, when assaulted by the power from without, could so readily yield obedience. The principle of all virtue, of all obedience, turns upon the condition of making the divine will, and not the human, the rule of life and action.

Here hung suspended in the form of *test* the whole of man's destiny, for weal or for woe. Adam was endowed by his Maker with physical and spiritual life. The "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," was to be the test by which this life was to be permanently established, or for ever forfeited. The awful warning consisted in this, "if you eat of it I will take away your life; you shall die bodily, spiritually, and eternally."

The tree of life could not have been effectually used before the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," had served its purpose, the same as the Lord's Supper, which cannot be properly used until man has come to a decision by rejecting sin and deciding in favor of holiness. The "tree of life," was to be the gate to immortality; so in the Christian Church we have Baptism as the gate to the Paradise of heaven. Christ, our second Adam, who again infused life and immortality into dead humanity, has entered upon *His* mediatorial office through the baptism of John, which was, it is true, only a baptism of repentance, but no less the gate by which He entered upon His mediatorial work. Here we have then the true idea of a sacrament, as distinguished from a mere sign or a mere remembrance of facts. It is a visible sign of invisible grace. The sign and grace flow together, as a common fact, and are one, if properly used, like soul and body. When the sign is used, the invisible grace is apprehended by faith at the time; the grace is bound to the sign at the time of baptism and at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. We must admit this explanation or we overthrow the idea of a Sacrament altogether, and thus destroy the idea of Christian faith.

The Bible also seems to imply, that Adam was not obliged to pass through sin in order to establish himself in true holiness. It is true, man could not have made an election on the side of the good, without seeing the possibility of making an election on the side of evil; yet he could have made this election of the good without an experimental knowledge of the evil. The ancient maxim, that we must enter into sin in order to know and understand its nature, so that we afterwards may be the better able to resist it, is absolutely false. Whatever choice Adam would make, he would thereby raise himself either into the sphere of life, or bring himself under the power of death. It is possible that the very commencement of the angelic life, as well as of the human, was a probationary process; because the very state implies the possibility of either resisting, or of yielding to the temptation when presented. This is clearly manifest from the history of those angels, who effectually resisted the temptation to which others yielded. If Adam had no power to resist the tempter; if his fall had been determined and unalterably fixed from eternity by God, then he only did what he was compelled to do, and cannot now be called to a moral account for the sin which he committed, because it was so determined from the beginning. We reject any such view as false, and as bringing dishonor upon God Himself. But on the other hand we find man, as he now comes into being, just what he made himself by his own free choice, in his federal head, Adam.

True, man may have been *physically* under the law or power of death before; for Geology proves that death was in the world, before the fall, yet man's physical nature by its union with the soul, and therefore with God, was capable of surmounting this law, and of rising to immortality. Had he not transgressed the law of God, his body would soon have become superior to the law of death, and his transition into a higher and more glorious sphere, would doubtless have taken place, but it would have been without pain, suffering, or any such violent rupture as we now have. It would have been as easy and pleasant as a change from youth to manhood. Had he resisted the temptation his eating of the "tree of life," would have been to him a sacramental pledge of immortality, which, not inherent in the tree itself, was to be derived from his union with Deity, as it is now. So in baptism and the Lord's Supper, it is not the mere act of being baptized, or the mere act of eating the bread and of drinking the wine, separately considered, which raises man into immortality, but the living union, with the Lord Jesus, into which the faithful are thus brought, the sacraments being the means or *medium*, through which Divine grace is communicated to man. The means of grace have no power to confer immortality on man the sinner, as such, but they have power to confer immortality on man the saint.

Adam's holiness was not a positive, developed holiness already established, as stated before. The "tree of life" was the test upon which was to be settled the fact, whether he would obey God, or the promptings of Satan. In either case he would have come to the knowledge of good and evil. Adam could not have fallen, if his previous condition had been one of positive holiness already fixed. He was in a state of innocence merely, without any positive affirmation on the side of holiness. If the authority of God had preponderated in Eve's mind, she would have resisted the temptation, and her probation would have been sustained, and so passed over into Adam.

The devil in the form of a serpent was the instrument by which our first parents were tempted and led into the transgression of the law of God. This transgression was not only a sin, but the entire overthrow of the whole of God's law. The penalty connected with the eating of the forbidden fruit was death. "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

It is not probable that man could have continued long in his innocent and happy condition in Paradise, without passing through some such process and trial. The trial came and Adam fell. He lost his integrity by making choice on the side of evil; and thus by "his own wilful disobedience, deprived himself and all his posterity of those Divine gifts," which he possessed before, or rather which were within his reach. Adam, thus, not only severed himself from God, but he also sundered the whole human race, as well as all the kingdoms of nature. The fall was doubtless in its primary conception an act of the spirit; an apostacy of the mind, which had to externalize itself in an outward form. This is what took place. The eyes of both were opened, they saw what was good and evil, and that they were naked. They had now a consciousness of their fallen state, and felt that they were like the man, whom Christ mentions in the parable, who, when, going from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among the robbers, was wounded, robbed, and stripped of all he had, and left bleeding and half dead on the highway. So they were not only robbed of all that they had, but also of all that which was within their reach before; ever unable to help themselves or to regain what they had actually lost, by any effort put forth by themselves.

Miserable, poor and full of fear, they fly from the presence of God and hide among the trees of the garden. By their sin and transgression they have separated themselves from their God. Their nature fallen, they now hate God, in whom they so much delighted before. But He calls them to an account, administers their punishment, and drives them from Paradise, the garden of pleasure, into the barren wilderness. That which constituted the sacredness of Paradise was the presence of God there. This sacredness would have enlarged and extended itself, had Adam maintained his integrity; his blessings, some in possession and others in prospect, would also have been conferred upon the race. Life and happiness would have gone forth from Eden, until the whole world would have been embraced and turned into one magnificent Paradise. Having fallen, sorrow, sickness and death follow them, as unwelcome companions, until their bodies returned to the dust. Well may they be represented as weeping bitter tears of repentance.

But that they might not despair now, the Almighty, before He drives them from His presence and takes a final leave of our first parents, gives them the promise of redemption, in the seed of the woman; and it is natural that we should also look for the dawn of redemption there. It is true, we do not, neither can we expect to find, the whole plan of redeeming grace there already fully revealed and developed, as we have it now, but we have it there already adumbrated in the "Tree of Life," as well as by word of promise in the seed of the woman.

After our first parents had broken the first covenant, the way of innocency to the "tree of life," was shut, the drawn sword of Cherubims guarded it; they would now strive in vain for righteousness, life, and happiness, by virtue of the first covenant. They now make themselves aprons of fig-leaves, to cover their nakedness; a covering far too short to wrap themselves in. God slays beasts, probably to show Adam what death meant, not so much for food, as for sacrifice, to typify the Great Sacrifice which in a later day should be offered once for all. These Sacrifices were divided between God and man in token of reconciliation; the flesh for a sacrifice to God, the skins for a covering to man. The whole transaction looking back, far beyond time and Creation, and forward to the Incarnation and sacrifice of "the Lamb of God which was slain before the foundation of the world," whose body was in due time to be offered up as the great and all Atoning Sacrifice, and whose righteousness was to be a covering for the nakedness of man in the sight of God. Thus redemption was contained in the plan of God just as much, and as really, as the fall. Hence we see that man could not by any effort he would put forth, ever regain what was actually lost or within his reach from the very start in Paradise, and represented in the visible sign of the tree of life, through which as the gate he could have entered into immortality, after a faithful maintenance of his integrity. We are thus made to feel that after the fall, the "tree of life" could no longer communicate life to man; no more than the mere eating of the Lord's Supper, can now introduce the life of Christ into our being in any such outward or mechanical way. The whole development of the Old Dispensation looks back from the very start, to a something underlying the whole, and forward to the coming and introduction of that something which underlies the whole, in which alone humanity can ever find the true centre and completion of its higher life. Man is therefore now totally disabled and disqualified from ever returning into Paradise again by his own nature and strength.

Adam was the representative head of the whole human race; or rather the race was comprehended in him as the source from which the whole stream of human being was to flow. And it is only when Adam is regarded as the organic head of the race, that his sin can be said to be imputed to the whole human race, both physically and legally. As our federal head the whole world is, through his fall, by sin sundered from its proper life in God. His sin, was our sin; his fall was our fall. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." We are heirs of a fallen life; Adam's sin is thus transplanted upon us, so that we are now of the nature and offspring of his fallen nature. For we are now all conceived and born in sin. "For as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" in Adam their generic head. Here Adam is made the root, source and foundation of all our sins. Not simply because he represented the race, but because the race was itself comprehended in him. His faithful obedience, on the other hand, would have been the very opposite in all respects of the penalty, and would have included physical, spiritual and eternal life; which was also as truly before him, and would have been as certainly conferred, had he resisted the temptation. "God ordained that he should transmit his human nature, whatever that nature might be, to his posterity; so that if he continued holy, he should transmit to them a holy nature, but that, if he became sinful, he must of necessity transmit to them a sinful nature. Through his own free will he ate of the forbidden fruit, and became sinful, and this before any children had been born to him; so that when he begat children, he transmitted to them, not the sinless nature which he possessed originally, but the sinful nature he received the moment he transgressed. Hence the fountain of human nature became poisoned at its source; the root of human nature became evil before a single branch or bud had sprung out of it. Hence when Adam begat children, they were in his likeness. Hence all mankind are sinners from the womb."*

Now to understand sin and death aright we must conceive of it as a state of darkness, abstraction, and limitation, coming only to its complete sense in the intermediate state, and that state would hold us in the realm and power of death: and this would have been an eternal state without the Gospel. The work of Christ has for its object, not only to free man from sin, but also to bring him out of this intermediate state. For this He descended into Hades. He not only redeemed our body, but also our spirit from that spiritual bondage, which would otherwise have held us in the realm and power of death. Christ's victory would not have been complete, had He not descended into Hades, the region of the dead. He went to preach to the spirits in prison.† There he confronted the powers of Hell and obtained a complete victory over death and the grave. His resurrection had to take place from there, to manifest His victory over death and hell. "I am he that liveth and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death."‡

Man by his fall came into a wrong relation with nature, and he was thus immediately brought under a law of death; a continual dissolution, which brings him at last to the grave. But the hope of the world, is, "As in Adam all die, even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive." And "as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." So on the other hand by one man Jesus Christ, "life and immortality was brought to light."

Natural death becomes intelligible only as we see it rest upon spiritual death. "Ye are dead in trespasses and sins." This is clearly manifest from the history of the world, which is full of confusion, contradiction and sin in every form and direction, showing a universal tendency towards sin and death. This being true, man is, therefore, naturally disqualified and disabled for the service of God.

---

* Rev. M. F. Sadler, on the Second Adam, page 10.

† 1 Peter iii. 19. ‡ Rev. i. 18.

If man had a mere physical life only, and no soul, his death would have been an entire annihilation. But he has the breath of life, derived from God, by which he became a living soul, that can never be blotted out. It is by that principle he bears a certain relation to God, in the form of reason and will.

If this then is true, and such is the condition of mankind, dead and lost by nature, it must manifest itself in the world, and in human society. If the theory laid down in reference to the fall of Adam, with its consequences upon the race is correct, it will be clearly illustrated in the bitter fruits of human life, and in the confused state of things in the world. That man has by natural generation an evil nature, is a truth which no one, but those tainted with Pelagian heresy will deny; for the proof not only lies in the book of inspiration, but it lies in the history of every family, and in every individual of the human race, as well as in the experience of every parent, and in the memory of each one of us as to what we were when in our childhood. "Here, then, is the mystery of the *moral* evil *naturally* engendered; of moral evil transmitted to those who receive it whilst they are in a state of unconsciousness,—with the very seeds of their being."

The cause of sin and wickedness coming into, or existing in the world, cannot be accounted for upon any other ground, except upon that which is given in the sacred pages of inspiration. If there is no *original or birth sin*, in which we are all conceived and born, it would be a most difficult undertaking to solve the great problem of human depravity. It is true some have labored hard to attribute it to a bad system of education. But if our first parents were wise and good, then, as we must naturally suppose, it is not only strange but perfectly mysterious and inexplicable, that they should not train up their children in wisdom and goodness, when as yet, there was no human being, either to teach, to tempt, or to instruct them by bad example.

If they are not fallen, if their nature is not corrupt, then certainly there ought to have been as many, at least, of good, as of wicked people in the world, for the chances ought to have been equal. But before the flood already, "all flesh had corrupted their ways before the Lord." If wickedness is the result of a bad education, the scales might some day, at least, have turned in favor of wisdom and virtue. Our first parents who had the education of their own children, were either wise and virtuous, or they were not. If they were good, vice did not spring from a bad system of education, because they would then teach in their perpetual line the holiness of their being• If bad, vice did not spring from a bad system of education, because it would then necessarily have been antecedent to a bad system of education. The first son ever born became a murderer. How was it at the time of the flood? Noah and his sons, only, were found righteous before God. It was little better from the flood to the time of Moses, neither was there a decided change in favor of virtue at the time of Christ; even God's own blessed people were a faithless and stubborn generation, far better, certainly than the heathen world around them, who knew not God, but far from that righteous people, which they should have been. At the coming of Christ both the Jews and Gentiles, were under the power of, yea all the world was lying in, guilt and misery. Even since the coming of Christ the wise and virtuous, have always been a small flock, comparatively speaking, when compared with the wicked. And many who externally belong to the family of God are but little better than polished heathens. This fact in itself is a strong evidence of the moral derangement of human nature, not to be accounted for by any system of education. Besides, *education has no power to originate, but only to bring out what is already in man.* Human depravity must then be the production of the life of man itself. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." The Son of Man who spake and taught as man never spake and taught, even had a Judas among His disciples. The only satisfactory way to account for all human depravity is that represented in the Bible, which makes it to proceed from the fall of Adam. "*In Adam all die.*" "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," and from him, sin and "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

After the fall man's understanding became clouded and impaired with ignorance; his heart alienated from God, his passions became irregular and vicious; in a word "his whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed and broken." You say perhaps, this is all true, but what! will God also punish the innocent for the wicked? All punishment presupposes guilt. Adam sinned and his posterity must suffer, because his guilt is transmitted to them, both morally and physically. The curse was pronounced upon the whole creation, upon the Serpent, the ground, and upon Adam and Eve. "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field." And unto Adam He said: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." Again "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain to this day," awaiting the dawn of its deliverance. And "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." The earth no longer yields her full increase. The actual wickedness of the antediluvian world, was the cause of its punishment and destruction. The posterity of Canaan was punished with slavery for Ham's sin. Infants must die for their sins, though they have not committed any actual sin. The men of Sodom and Gomorrah had to die for their sins. The Jewish kingdom was destroyed and many thousands perished in its destruction, all because of sin.

The earth even, which was designed for the habitation of man, carries many powerful tokens of ruin and desolation in her bosom, as well as on her surface, which were not so designed for happy and innocent beings. Even the shape of our globe bears clear evidence of ruin and confusion. What broken mountains hang over the weary traveler, and what stupendous cliffs rise high and are awful to behold! What dreadful precipices ready to engulf us! What resistless deluges of water come rushing down the mountains, sweeping everything before them, spreading desolation far and wide! What tremendous waterfalls! What burning mountains in different parts of the world, destroying and covering cities and towns, and laying waste vast regions of country with fiery ruin! What powerful storms sweep over the land, with thunder and lightning, and hail, threatening us with instant destruction! Would the God of heaven have laid up, within the bowels of the earth, such stupendous forces, to bring out at special seasons, either to drown or burn the world with its sinful inhabitants, if man had not fallen? Is this world such a beautiful and safe place as a kind Creator would have made if man had not fallen?

If we look at the vegetable world, the same curse is visible there. Thorns and thistles are the natural productions of the earth: nor does the earth yield half her increase. Even these productions are often injured by various causes, such as drought or hail-storms, or ruined by insects.

If we look at the brute creation, they too must suffer for the sin which man has committed. It is an undeniable fact, of almost daily occurrence, that many animals and insects are destroyed by man, purely out of self-defence. True, many creatures serve the use of man, but many others, he is neither able to govern, nor to resist; to which the whole race is exposed. Would the flesh and blood of innocent creatures have been crushed between the jaws of lions, tigers, sharks, and crocodiles, if man had not sinned and fallen? And what numberless serpents lie concealed, ready to insert their deadly poison as soon as man or beast comes within their reach. What immense flights of locusts sweep over the land and lay waste fruitful fields and gardens!

Let us go a step further, and look at man himself, would he have been brought into the world with such exquisite pain and anguish? Not if sin and the curse had not come upon him. Even his life is only preserved by the greatest care and toil. What exertions he has to make, and risks to run, in order to keep his body and soul from want. What cares in reference to what he shall eat and drink, or how he shall keep himself and his family from starvation.

Let us still go a step further, and look upon mankind in regard to religion and virtue, and we will see that his natural image is not one of holiness, but one of spontaneous outgrowth of wickedness and sin. Go to the heathen world, do you not find that it lieth in thick darkness; their worship is idolatry; their gods neither see, hear, nor feel, to whom in their wild fanaticism and blind delusion they offer human sacrifices to appease their anger. What constant wars, oppressions, tyranny and bloodshed meet us at every step!

Go to the Christian world; what little knowledge or thought of God is found either in children or men. What sinful propensities appear in their early life, though their parents are pious and set them holy examples, before bad ones are presented. What anger, passion, and selfishness is early developed. The same seed of evil is there; the same disposition to sin and wickedness is there as in the children of the ungodly. Sin can only be engendered, either by nature, temptation or example.

Looking at all this, will any one in spite of these facts, yet say, that no curse rests upon the body and soul of Adam and his posterity?

Again think of the thousands of human beings that hourly pass to the grave, a few only by sudden death, the great mass by long and painful sufferings. This dark prison of the grave would never have been made by Him who gave us life and being, if we had not forfeited His divine favor. The wages of sin is death, and from this punishment we cannot escape. Had man stood the test, not one would have died, much less the whole human race. We might also enumerate the many thousands that have been killed by earthquakes, pestilence, war and famine, which count their victims by millions. Every year between twenty and thirty millions of human beings pass into eternity! Could the holy and blessed God have originally framed a world with so much misery and death? Certainly not. All this must have been brought in by some outward force; and this is the statement of revelation. The *Devil* is the prime mover and instigator of all this misery, to whom man yielded ready obedience, and thereby became estranged from God, and deprived himself and all his posterity of divine gifts. But what is the most astounding of all is, that man made miserable by the devil's intrigues, does yet so tenaciously cling to such a ruinous master; serving him with the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life, perfectly reckless of all final consequences. You see him at the dance, around the card-table, in rum-holes, and in many other places equally bad, and some much worse, giving his body soul and spirit to Satan's service, the arch-enemy of man. All this is done, even after Redemption is offered to him.

All this would seem to show in irrefragable conclusions, the general depravity of the human race. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh"—sinful flesh. Will you reform human nature, this sinful nature must be destroyed and buried, and a new life implanted from above, before any radical change for the better can ever take place. And this is *Redemption*. For the salvation of man, it requires the descent of a new principle, or the implanting of a new life into the sphere of humanity. This is the sense of our Saviour's language to Nicodemus, in that powerful expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit."

ART. V.—THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, CAVETOWN, MD.

IN the opinion of the friends of the Sunday-school, as now organized, without doubt it will be considered presumptuous, to call its practical working into question. It claims age,—has many friends and is now organized into a system, and as such, we are confidently told, that it is the hope of the Church. Starting out with claims like these, and in our day carrying everything with it in its course, it may seem bold to ask for calm and earnest inquiry, in order to try these claims. Is it not an agency organized for accomplishing great good, and has it not enlisted in its service the active co-operation of the best men and women in the land, and is it not the nursery of the Church, and as such worthy of the confidence and support of every sincere follower of the Lord? These assumptions are freely and readily made,—made once and again with all confidence, but need not necessarily be true, because thus made. For our part, we question them, notwithstanding the influence and weight of the system assured that Diana of the Ephesians was not greater than the God of Paul, though all the inhabitants of the city declared that she was. Whatever may be thought of the attempt to call the practical working of the Sunday-school system into question, we propose in this article candidly to investigate it and endeavor to determine the relation in which it stands to the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ.

In the outset we are free to say, that in our experience as pastor, and no doubt that of many others, the Sunday-school as now organized, is not the nursery of the Church, neither her hope, as is so repeatedly asserted. The truth is, the Sunday-school is often carried on, by practically ignoring the order of Grace, established by our blessed Redeemer, which challenges confidence and hearty trust, as the Mystical Body of Christ, in which our spiritual nature is prepared and fitted for this life and also for heaven. Even in schools well regulated, questions from thence come before Sunday-school Conventions, something like this: "By what means can the attendance of Sunday-school children, on the services of the sanctuary, be best secured?" from which there is room to suspect, that many do not attend divine service, and hence, have no conception of the nature and design of the Church of Christ.

The object of the Sunday-school is a noble one; its friends are aware of the fact, that our nature is alienated from God, and that the child comes into the world with this force against it; all are aware of the slumbering giant, reposing in the heart, and all that is wanted to call him out is time and occasion. But even here, (if we may judge from a great portion of our Sunday-school literature,) how imperfectly is not this fact apprehended, and how hopeless it must be to apply a remedy where the disease is not understood. Now be it understood as it may, the Sunday-school proposes to correct and amend this generally accepted fact, and in some way endeavor to bring the soul of the child into proper relations to God and to Christ. That this is so, is evident from the assertions of numberless, hopeful conversions to God, which during a year, have taken place in the Sunday-school. Here, the child is taken up by the system and in the hands of skilful teachers, so handled, as to bring about such glorious results. But is it not clear, that all this is in a system which has a peculiar theory of our nature, as fallen, as well as the means by which it is to be recovered, and is something different from that which obtained in the Church formerly, and which should prevail in our day?

In order that our nature may be rescued from the deeps into which it has fallen, there must be left to it some connecting link with which the grace of God may be linked for its recovery. Is it true, then, that our "nature is totally depraved," that no room is left where grace may lay hold, that there must needs be the creation of a new one, so that the soul may be brought into the favor and love of God? It is this fact with which the Sunday-school proposes to deal, but how indifferently is it held, and how imperfectly understood so that it might be turned to practical account. Our nature is in a state of estrangement from God, but so, that God's grace may reach it and be recovered, and this fact is to be taught distinctly and clearly to the child. This condition is set forth by the term "*fallen*," and fallen in such a sense that, unaided it can never of itself rise again. It is of great account that this fact should be well understood—that every one might understand the relation in which the soul stands to God, the source from whom life comes and where it holds. "Now, the nature of man is not indifferent. It is not partly good and partly evil; it must then be essentially evil or essentially good. Say that it is essentially evil—*the nature of man*—not merely his words, or his actions, or his thoughts evil, but *his nature;* suppose that this is so, and what is the result and consequence? . . . "It follows, then, that the nature of man cannot be in itself essentially evil." . . "that human nature is of itself and in itself essentially good," p. 34. "And what are we? The answer is, we are "fallen," this is the answer of all Christians. "We are fallen." "But how far fallen—*to what degree?* The answer with reference to degree is, "*so far fallen* as yet to be *men.*" Not so far *as to cease to be men;* but so far as, *being still men*, we could fall: fallen, but not *so fallen* as to be *devils*, *all evil in nature*, or *to be beasts*, altogether indifferent to *good.* Man's nature is a fallen nature; "*as far gone as he can be*" from original righteousness, but not farther: a nature *still human.* Not a *fiendish nature or a bestial one.* p. 34.* The voice of the Christian Church is clear and distinct on this point. The confessions set forth the fact clearly and hold the necessity that this fallen nature must be lifted up, and brought upon a plane whereon the great work of redeeming the soul may have place. This great fact now is practically denied in the Sunday-school scheme, for by this scheme this fallen nature of ours is taken hold of and attempts are made to lift it up and place it into union with the source from whence it came and then fell away, independent of means, heretofore regarded as essential. That this is simply a fact, may be gathered from a great portion of our Sunday-school literature, books in which instances are detailed as having had place in the Sunday-school where little souls were taken up and beautifully carried along until they gloriously passed over into heaven, and in the whole beautiful picture, there is not one word said of grace given by God whereby to lift the fallen soul on to a plane where such glorious results are to be wrought out. We are afraid that the system stands in that low humanitarian scheme, common in our day, which sees no necessity for the Church, nor for her ordinances for the purposes of redemption.

---

* These quotations are made from "The Elements of Christian Science," A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice, by William Adams, S. T. P., a work which has no sympathy with our modern, selfish philosophy, but which cuts it up by the roots, a book worthy of being carefully studied by every lover of sound morality and religion.

The scheme from God for the restoration of our fallen nature.

By the disobedience and fall of our first parents sin came upon the race,—the fall reached this nature in such a way " that we are all conceived and born in sin " Sin now commenced to do its fearful work, and in its march spread desolation and death. But God left not fallen man to himself, but with the transgression came also the promise of redemption. But who can conceive of the vast, far-reaching effect of sin ? We are told " that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now,"—that by the interposition of God's power, the curse is to be taken away and " the restitution of all things " is to be brought about. But this was not by the agency of fallen man. It is not to be by the education of our nature to the highest possible standard, as our modern scientists vainly dream, but by the power of God, in the great work of Redemption. The " seed " of the woman alone could bruise the head of the serpent. The recovery of the race stood first in promise. The promise was repeated and anew declared to the patriarchs, and the earnest child, bound for eternity, could in confidence look to this promise, assured of its truth and faithfulness. Like the Israelite of old, with the infused poison from the fiery serpents, by looking to the brazen serpent on the pole was healed, so the soul, conscious of its fallen state, under a deep sense of its misery, could look to *this promise* and die in hope of pardon and forgiveness. Its efficacy lay in the *substance* contained in the promise—a looking forward to the "seed" to come, in whom the promise found meaning and fulfilment. It had reference to the redemption of this fallen nature, the restoration of it, as alienated and estranged. This recovery did not proceed on the ground of mere declaration, nor a given order from heaven, but the plan or scheme in the mind of God revealed itself and became fully organized in the race, as fallen, on which plane or sphere the great work was to be effected. The race was lying under the curse,—was sinful, and as such was alienated. The purpose of God was to bring this estranged, fallen nature, again into proper relations to Him. It was to be lifted out of this state, not by a decree or order from heaven, but by an act, in the race, which was to organize itself, so that by its unfolding, humanity might be reached and taken up by it, and thus salvation made possible for it. This act commences in the calling of Abraham, the father of the faithful, and making a covenant with him and his seed forever. Here we have the gathering together of a family—a body of people, descendants of the Father of the Faithful, to whom promises were made and once and again repeated. There is here already, a clear distinction between this selected family and the world outside, and to this selected people, truly, were promises made, and to their children. Here the family, "and to your children," stood in peculiar relations to God. In the onward course of history, these promises came to fulfilment. The "seed" which was to bruise the head of the serpent, had appeared. Prophecy received fulfilment. The shadow gave place to the substance or reality. The Lord Jesus Christ became Incarnate,—the Word was made flesh. A new life entered the race—a power or force from heaven—the new creation—to lift this fallen life from its depths, and to bring it into living relations with God, through this Incarnate Redeemer. It is clear now how this fact, passed into act, and commenced organizing. It rested in the grand fact of the Incarnation,—it organized around the glorious Person of Christ, shedding light from thence, towards which the Jew was enabled, in faith, to look, and it comprehended forces and powers for reaching the ends proposed. In this *fact* was life. As such, it began to unfold itself, not so much in the form of doctrine or decree, as *life* for a world fallen and lying in sin. It has only one centre around which it ever turns, which for us is the Lord of Life, who is with His people always. This grand fact of life, accordingly, perpetuates itself in the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, with unbroken succession to the end of time. No power can overthrow it. "The gates of hell shall never prevail against her." Is this now a fact, general, extending over the vast domain of fallen humanity, or is it only for those that in some way are made sharers in this life? In other words does the whole world, fallen as it is, share in this glorious fact, so that universal redemption may be predicated of the race; or, is the theory of universal redemption tenable? It needs but a partial acquaintance with Scripture to apprehend the fallacy of the proposition, affirming universal salvation. It is true, as the Scriptures unequivocally assert, that in the Lord Jesus Christ the redemption made is universal, that is to say, that His life for redeeming, extends as far as the curse, that it is as broad as the fall, and has capacity—merit, to save the race from its misery; it is on the other hand equally true, that not all of the race will be saved. In the twentieth question of the Heidelberg Catechism it is asked, "Are all men, then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ? No, only those who are ingrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits by a true faith." The provision made by the Lord Jesus Christ is universal, and the atonement is not a partial nor a limited one, but only those who are ingrafted into Him become sharers in His life, and it becomes limited by human will. "He that *believeth and is baptized shall be saved*, he that *believeth not shall be damned.*"

Assuming now this fact, that an application of the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ must be made to the soul, fallen and estranged from God, we find already in the days of the Apostles a distinction, holding clearly between "the believing" and "the worldly." This aforesaid fact now clearly reveals itself in "the community of the faithful," in the Mystical Body of Christ, having in its bosom divinely commissioned mediators, opening the door of entrance to the obedient and submissive, and closing it to those unbelieving and refractory. In this process of separation, winnowing out, is contained a fearful prophecy of what is to come at the last day. In the Epistles of the Apostles, we have the same fact clearly stated. They recognize this life, as organized, as comprehended in "the community of the faithful," and clearly affirm a broad separation between it and the world. St. Paul commences his Epistle to the Romans, thus, "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, *called to be saints.*" To the Corinthians, "To them that are sanctified in Jesus Christ, called to be saints," &c. To the Ephesians, "To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful that are in Christ Jesus." And so uniformly in all the Epistles. This fact is frequently overlooked in our day of spiritual accommodation. The plain teaching is, that in the arrangement of Infinite wisdom, God provided a scheme–provided a "Home" into which the soul of the fallen child of Adam could enter, in which are powers to heal it from the curse and to fit and prepare it for the glories of the heavenly world. But it is clear that this peculiar relation must be entered,—a relation in which life only is to be found,—a relation differing heaven-wide from that of the child of the world. We are aware that this will be considered hard by the liberal-minded and eagerly accommodating, but we are sure that it is the scheme coming from heaven which challenges confidence and trust, on pain of eternal damnation.

In the bosom of this community—or this order thus organized, the powers of the heavenly world are at hand and we have here a plane, or rather *the* plane to which the fallen soul is to be lifted, so that it may be recovered from sin. Here a field opens up, on the threshold of which, we meet with great diversity of sentiment—different theories but all looking to the same result. And here, precisely, we have the force of what has been already advanced in reference to our nature as fallen.

But how often is not this nature taken hold of by instruction and guidance without having been lifted on to this plane, and gloriously carried along, until all at once, it is landed on the shores of bliss. In the face of Sunday-school literature of that order, and often Sunday-school speeches, and the open position of the Sunday-school system, generally, ignoring the powers of this organized fact in Christ Jesus, we are led to ask seriously, of what necessity such a scheme, and is there such a plane to which this fallen nature may be lifted, of which then and there it may be be affirmed as by the Apostle "saints," and "faithful in Christ Jesus," &c. This is not the scheme of the Sunday-school system, and this fact is making itself felt, more and more every day. It stands on different grounds, and this plane would be regarded, in a Sunday-school Convention as squinting towards priestcraft and as one binding tender consciences. We ask for proof in reference to the position assumed by the Sunday-school generally, as being true, and cannot believe, that our fallen nature is restored, as we are often told in its literature, in the way and manner frequently set forth, but assert, in opposition that there is vast difference holding between the soul in living relation with this scheme, or ingrafted into Him,—the Mystical Body of Christ, and the soul that is in nature, fallen, in other words, a vast difference between being in the Church of Christ, His Mystical Body and out of it and so beyond it. And who will say that this fact is not ignored in the vast majority of Sunday-schools in the country and no practical account made of it? And where this is the case, does not the Sunday-school as now organized, sustain somewhat of a foreign relation to the Church of Christ, and is not the work carried on, generally, outside of her bosom, and does it not amount in numberless cases, only to beating the air? It is no wonder that the scheme is beginning to reveal its weakness and disappointing the sanguine expectations of its earnest and warm friends.

The question now arises, if the Redemption made by the Lord Jesus Christ is of this universal order, and is beyond the individual, or objective to him, how shall it become subjective, so that the individual is made a partaker of its advantages? Will we say by penitence, by loving God, as much of the Sunday-school literature puts it, and in that way fitting the fallen soul for the blessed fellowship offered by the Lord Jesus Christ? That would seem to imply this, that you prepare for it on the plane of nature, and on the ground of this preparation the individual becomes a sharer in its blessings, an attempt to make ourselves meritorious before God. Has not God prepared a plane—a sphere on which and in the bosom of which, we become penitent and believing, and are not these forms, which the Christian life ever takes: or, is the theory true, so alarmingly prevalent in our day, that this Mystical Body of Christ is only a place for safe keeping, after the soul has passed through penitence and come out believing, and that out of this bosom, beyond her pale, and so out of this divine order, the great work looking to salvation has all been done? No, God lifts into this order. He places the soul, now in its fallen condition, into the warm bosom of this divinely organized fact, and on this plane, in this sphere, "called to be saints," "its calling and election is to be made sure." In this relation, there is force in the words of the Apostle, when he speaks to "the faithful in Christ Jesus," as well as in the first Answer in the Heidelberg Catechism, where it is said. . . "that in life and in death, in soul and in body I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ." It has meaning in the mouth of one standing in this relation and from hence affirming it. No one can lift himself into this relation. No matter how much one may mimic and imitate, nor through what state of feeling and experiences the soul may pass. In this helpless and hopeless state of nature we remain, "unless we are regenerated by the Spirit of God." This is effected by sacramental acts, and by them, the soul is lifted up and out of its fallen state and planted into this sphere —placed on this plane, for its proper unfolding in grace and holiness and securing "its calling and election." Precisely here is one of the difficulties of our day. Rationalistic skepticism at once steps in and begins to doubt and to wonder, "How can these things be," and then, what of those not thus lifted up?

To all this it may be replied, that it is not for us to say what God may or may not do. It is enough that the fact lies thus in the Scriptures,—that it was thus apprehended by "the community of the faithful," and has ever been practiced thus in the Church of Jesus Christ. It is a fact, painfully to be admitted, that our skeptical age practically denies this order or scheme,—the reigning spirit repudiates it, and the stream in which the Sunday-school system stands partakes to a great extent of this spirit, and in the literature and speeches, generally, made at Sunday-school Conventions such an idea or plan is out of place and without much ceremony would be considered ritualistic and squinting towards Rome. It is amusing, and yet painfully humiliating to see how everywhere, even in our Church, this "harp of a thousand strings," is taken up and played on, and how ready, all for effect, common cause is made with this spirit so alien to this ancient, churchly one. In this system, now common, it is somewhat difficult to obtain an intelligent idea as to the method by which this fallen nature is lifted up. It is similar to the advice, and, as it is often called, instruction which is given to penitents at an anxious bench, when the excitement is at the highest pitch, "Struggle on, struggle on," amounting to an attempt to lift one-self up, by laying hold on himself for that purpose. It would be well for the interest involved, to look the case deliberately and steadily in the face, in order to understand it.

The recovery of our fallen nature, starts in the bosom of the Christian Family. We have shown before, that our fallen nature is lifted from a state of nature, in which all naturally are, to a state of grace, by *Sacramental Acts*. These acts have meaning and force in the bosom of this divinely ordered Institution. Accordingly in the Apostolic age, as detailed in the New Testament (and the same is true as we have it in the Old Testament under a modified form), there is gathered together the believing husband or wife, or both, as comprehended in the number of "the Faithful in Christ Jesus," and to them it is declared that "the promise is not only to you but also to your children." The child born in the bosom of the Christian

Family, is notwithstanding this, "born in iniquity—conceived in sin," and is as all others are in nature, and as such, "a child of wrath even as others." It is true that it has the blessed advantage of standing in the bosom of the Christian Family, but that itself cannot lift it from this state of nature. It needs the same ingrafting process by the Holy Ghost, as any other one,—the same Sacramental Act from God to lift it up, whereby to plant the fallen nature into that of grace. Hence the necessity for the interposition of Almighty God. By Christian Baptism—water and the Spirit, it is dedicated to God—introduced into the covenant,—planted into Grace—lifted on to the plane on which the Christian fights the good fight of faith. The child is now a baptized member of the Mystical Body of Christ, and stands in the bosom of this divine order—the Christian Family, where it has the advantage of Christian example, Christian instruction, blessed advantages, if properly employed, to draw out this implanted life, and assist in its spiritual growth and in making its calling and election sure. The trouble is, that the reigning spirit of Christianity in our day, refuses to see and acknowledge this fact, but studiously repudiates and disowns it.

What is the idea of the Christian Family? What is the origin of the Family? What are its advantages? Who are its educators? What is the design of the Family? These are important questions, especially in our skeptical age, which is gradually taking out the keystone of the arch, as we may see, in the degradation to which marriage is subjected, by stripping it of all its sacredness and making it but a "contract." What can be more infidel?

The family has its existence in society. Accordingly, back of this, is the idea of Society, and this is "a divine institution, and coeval with man, an organization for fixed and determined purposes, and in set and determinate forms.". . . "that society in itself is one grand school of teaching, divided into three, which teaches in the family, love; in the nation, justice and equity; in the Church, holiness." Adams, p. 265. It will not be necessary to discuss the theory of society, though in our day of skepticism, the old "social contract" theory is becoming to be very far, at least, practically, accepted and the seeds of these dragon teeth sown broadcast over the land, are beginning to bring seed. This we see in the loose views of the family—the endless divorces which are granted for trivial reasons.—the attempts to degrade the female portion of the race, by bringing them into the fearful pools of sin where unscrupulous men revel. How different from this worldly view is the theory maintained and firmly held by the Church, and how much grander, falling in with our high origin and sublime destiny! "Wherever, even in the fewest numbers, the man is seen, there is he seen in society; he enters into society as a member of a family; where there are two or three families, there is government in the tribe, which is the nation in little, and there is worship. Where there is, either from newness or from desolation by famine, pestilence, war, or emigration, only one family in the land, the three elements are seen coexisting in the one social organization, which is at once a family, a nation in little, and a Church, and the head at once is father, and king or chief magistrate, and priest. These relations are not made by any supposed compact, but are coeval with man, for as far back as we go we see them exist, and we see no evidence of contract constituting them." p. 269. In the destiny awaiting man, he needs this institution from God, and his nature is fitted for it as the best possible form in which he may work out the great problem, which lies before him to be solved. Now of the origin of the family take the following: "Wherever, as we have shown, man appears, there society appears, simultaneously as it were, and coeval with his existence. Man *as made* was one, it is true, at first, but afterwards, when the LORD GOD said, "It is not good that the man should be alone,' from his flesh and bones was made a partner for him, and since then, man *as born* has always come into society—he has been born into it. And this Society made up of a pair, a man and a woman living together,—a husband and a wife.* This pair, with their offspring, constitute the family. Their dwelling is called the home.'' p. 270. This is the view of ethics called Christian, and knows nothing of the heathen conception of Society and the family,* nor of the more modern theory, advocated by some, in which they claim to find, *for themselves*, a progenitor in the monkey or ourang-outang. Let those who will claim this origin, as a being destined for immortality, we beg to be excused, but claim origin from God, "having been created in his image."

---

* "House-band"—the union of the house.
Wife from "weiben" to weave or unite.

Now in this view of the family, we have many relations. "Hence result a multitude of relations of persons—of husband to wife, of wife to husband, of parents to children, of children to parents, of brothers to sisters, of sisters to brothers. All these manifestly are relations between persons in society, and that society composed of these persons is the family." "And again, owing to the nature of man, which is a nature in space and time, this society, the family, has a *place of habitation*, a dwelling to itself exclusive, in which only the one family dwells, or ought naturally to dwell, the home,—and the society therein is, as it were, set apart from the rest of the world by visible and tangible limits: defined by them to be, although composed of many members and many relations naturally, still *one only*: one by exclusion of others from without; one by union of interests and feelings and mutual aid within: one by authority and by love. A oneness of organization with manifoldness of members and relations and affections. There is authority there, in the authority of the Father. And there also naturally exists the unity of love, represented in all its possible relations, and flowing, as it were, from one fountain, the mother.'' pp. 270-271.

---

* Quum pro repserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum ac turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
Unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant carmis, quæ post fabricaverat usus:
Donec verba, quiêbus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenere: dehinc absistere bello,
Oppida coeperunt munire, et ponere leges,
Ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter.
Hor. Sat. Lib. i. 3.

The object of the family then, is to elevate this nature of ours—to lift it up and bring it into closer relation to God, the source of all life and blessedness, and where men are found living far below these blessed privileges and rights, it is because, in spite of them, they voluntarily sank into this debasing condition. The efforts now made, in the attempt to undermine the family relations, will go far to produce such disastrous results. All the institutions from God, whatsoever their nature or character, are given and ordered by Him, for our benefit, to elevate and finally redeem us. In reference now to the institution of the Family, "The foundation, then, of the family, and its Law, I seek in the nature of man and of society, and in the express law of God. These are they that make and constitute the law of marriage and the law of the family; and human legislation is good so far as it expresses and reflects these." p. 272. As an institution from God, the family is so ordered that its members shall reach the end proposed if diligent and faithful to its well defined and established laws. Hence then, duties and responsibilities, belong to parent and child. In the minds of many persons, who have imbibed the practical principles of our modern selfish philosophy, each one acts for himself and cares for himself. There are so many parents now, who live and act as if there were no duties nor responsibilities—as if there were but this life and no hereafter." . . . " there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of parents in our land who act upon these views, and discharge themselves, *as far as they can*, from all duties of education, of religious training, of moral influence and superintendence, and, at the bottom, hold the mere physical view that the *home* is *not* sacred, but is the mere dwelling-place of a pair of animals having reasoning powers, whose united relation is merely to minister to one another's comfort, and who have positively no moral duty, no religious, no educational one to fulfil to their offspring—nothing but a mere physical one: that of giving them food and clothing until they are able to give it to themselves.

"I say, too, that of so-called religious men, there are multitudes who take precisely the same views, who, upon any and every pretext, are ready to devolve upon others the duties they themselves should perform towards their children." Adams, p. 301. How literally true in our day where parents roll over this whole responsibility on the Sunday-school teacher.

Then again the ever-willingness to devolve on others duties which none but the guardians in a family can perform. Take the following: "Man is a threefold being: 'spiritual,' 'rational,' 'corporeal, or animal.'" "If you act in the house, towards children as a mere animal, then shall the reward you obtain be nothing but this. I do not conceive that nestlings, when grown to maturity, make any difference between their parents and other full-grown birds—that dogs or horses, or other animals have any feeling towards the parents for a longer time than they are attached to them by physical wants and physical instinct. There is no gratitude, no love, no reverence, no respect, after the time of growth is past. Full growth and maturity of age puts the parent upon precisely the same ground as all other animals of the kind." "But man is a spiritual being as well. His marriage is not a bare animal union, but one moral and spiritual in the highest degree. His home is spiritual and moral too, and parents have spiritual and moral duties to do. If they do them not, but evade them, neglect them, free themselves from all obligation of them, so that really only the mere physical duty of supplying food and clothing is done, then the animal result is the consequence—thanklessness, disobedience, neglect, want of respect, and want of affection upon the part of children. I excuse them not for this; children of such temper and conduct sin before God, and are guilty because of it; but this I do say; the sin of the father is *the cause*, bringing most certainly, *as effect*, the sin of the children. p. 302. Besides these there are other duties—duties intellectual and duties moral. Among these is "maintenance," as Blackstone says, "a principle of natural law," "an obligation laid on them, not only by nature herself, but by their own proper act in bringing them into the world." Here is a clear right, primal in order, a right arising from the body, because of its helplessness and inability of self-support. Then too as the same author remarks, p. 304, "And here we shall remark, that there is a very great difference, morally, between the ways in which these things are done; of themselves they are merely animal, and may be done merely as such,—still they are done. And the same duties may be done in a spirit of love, affection, tenderness of feeling, sympathy; this last ensures love and gratitude;—the first, ingratitude and thanklessness." But the child in the family is to be prepared for the duties of life and for the fruition of the life to come. It is unnatural to leave it to its own instincts, as the animal leaves its offspring,—the child is to come under the genial influence of the home,—parental authority and Christian education. But in man on the contrary, the instinct is very small, and the understanding or mental faculty, very great. And hence do we see the time during which men are placed under the direct influence and guidance of their parents, to be very long indeed, and to bear a large proportion of the whole life, compared with the same period in other annals. Man's growth to maturity is exceedingly slow, the period of subordination and parental control exceedingly long. That which other animals learn by instinct, with only brief hints from the experience of the parents, man learns slowly and gradually by the process of mental growth and mental development, through experience, imitation, instruction, example, emulation, sympathy." "There is, then, manifestly a duty bounden upon the parents, an express obligation so to educate and train the mental powers of children, that they shall be enabled, after separation from their parents, to support themselves honestly and reputably." p. 305. And so the duty is binding on the parents and extends over the whole domain pertaining to the child, maintenance, mental cultivation, religious or spiritual cultivation, and where there is failure in any of these there is dereliction in duty, and the family fails to accomplish the end of its institution.

While the child has a right to these claims, the duty goes even beyond these and extends to the spiritual. "In few, because, though some appreciate the value of giving education to their children, and almost all feel the necessity of supplying bodily maintenance, yet very few seem to know that there is a spiritual faculty in man, that that faculty needs education, and that the parent is the teacher of that faculty appointed by God, with peculiar privileges, peculiar powers and abilities, unto that purpose adapted, which *he* can exercise, and *no one else*." p. 310. In the family are at hand all the forces for a correct and solid foundation for life, for the child ; in its bosom the educating and training of the moral and spiritual powers of the child are to have place. Adams now lays down two propositions, 1st. That "children have, from the earliest years, moral faculties which require education." 2d. "That physical maintenance, and physical training, and mental education, are not that spiritual education, *but entirely distinct from it*, so that one may *be mentally educated* to the very highest of cultivation, and *have no spiritual education at all*." "This moral education, then, the child has the faculty for, because he has a moral nature that requires and needs, yea yearns for it, and searches after it. And the man is not perfect as a man without it ; going forth into life without it, he goes forth halt and maimed, and imperfect, as he would if he went forth with a limb of his body incapable, or a sense destroyed, or a mental faculty decayed. The child from earliest years has a moral nature capable of a peculiar moral education, which is distinct from mental education, and the needs and nature of man's life and of society demand that training to the future man from his parents." pp. 311, 312. The author enters then on the interesting discussion, "what shall be the spiritual or moral education the child has a right from the parents to claim ?" "We look upon the child taken by its parents to the house of God, and there, by the principles of sympathy, imitation and habit, acting as others do, and feeling as others feel, to be thereby learning principles without knowing it, which years after he may apply consciously with full knowledge of their value. . . . and yet by the action so enforced upon them, they plant in them that principle in their nature, so that it really exists," &c. "This, then, I say, that parents *in their houses*, in all their actions, are teachers, unconsciously often to themselves, unconsciously, at the same time, to their children. The family is a school in which, of the father that is holy and good and true, of the mother that is affectionate and loving, there is not an act, not a word, not a perceptible emotion that does not teach; not a command to a child to act in this way or that, *even although that child does not understand the principle of the action*, that is not a teaching of that principle. . . . And this is a work that nature gives to one class of workmen, the training in religion and morality of the child by the father and by the mother in the home; and it is capable of being done *until the age of maturity;* and is done *by none else as it is by them.*" "Pious fathers and pious mothers, look to this! There is an influence, a power, an authority you have *by your position*, over *your children. You* can give it or delegate it to none. No amount of talents, or learning, or educational ability, or personal holiness can give to another who is *not their parent* the power that you have by your position as parent. Although your lips may stammer and your knowledge be small, still *from you* to *them* (this is the rule by nature), a word shall be as a kindling flame, as an awakening trumpet, as the voice of doom, as the infallible oracles of God. A gesture shall teach, a glance of the eye be remembered for a life-time, an action bidden implants a principle. For the *parent* in his *home*, teaching and acting upon God's *laws*, has *authority* which none else has, and which he can transfer to none else. And in the heart of the child there is a *power*, the spiritual reason, whose food this teaching is, and which is adapted to receive it." "And upon this ground, the ground of the spiritual reason and its peculiar powers, we warn parents, whoever may be the teacher of their children in other things, themselves to take a share in the religious and moral education of their own children at home; for they by their position, by the nature of divine truth, and the faculty that receives it, can do what none else can do, and teach as none else can teach." pp. 154, 155.

In this divine order, with conditions like these presented by the author, it cannot be difficult to see the results practically reached, and who cannot see the relation in which the child stands to the Church and to Christ? Where such a state of things exist, where the family is properly apprehended, where the solemn responsibilities and duties are fully met, there is, in truth, no room for such an institution as our modern Sunday-school, the ground is all taken up and covered and cultivated far better than can possibly be done by this modern institution. Neither did the Sunday-school originate to supplant the family. Its origin had no reference to this point, and yet we find that present facts do not correspond with this normal state of society and of the family. Of late years, the solid foundation of society and of the Christian family has been gradually undermined. The sacred order of matrimony has been secularized and well nigh broken up. The idea is wide-spread, that marriage is only a "contract," essentially the conception which our infidel philosophy has of the rite. Divorces (and there can be none, save but for one cause), are counted by scores and hundreds. The State never can annul the marriage relation; it has no power nor control over it, and in its frequent attempts to do so, it is only tampering with the keystone in the arch of society, and to a great extent, has succeeded, vandal-like, in pulling down one of its chief supports. The philosophy on this subject, in the "dark period" of the middle ages, is superior to ours, for that held inviolate the marriage relation. And now as a consequence, "these sour grapes are setting teeth on edge," and we have the disturbed, disordered condition of the family. In numberless instances the family partakes more of a heathen than Christian character. No sense of its holy origin and its high, solemn mission, no sense of responsibility, nor of duty, and instead of meeting and answering its end, as a "house," a "home," a school for the preparation for life, it becomes often a hot-bed, breeding infamy and shame. This modern idea is infidel in its conception, fruitful of vice and immorality, and unquestionably dangerous to our social, civil and religious liberties. Infinitely more formidable and by far more to be dreaded is this pernicious tendency, than Rome, with all her supposed abominations and corruptions. On this very point Rome may justly and very properly retort, "Physician, heal thyself."

We have thus, at length, set forth the idea of the Christian family, which has power in its own bosom, to correct these vices coming in, and we believe that here is found the proper lever to lift society up, but in our day there is an ignoring of this, and attempts are made independently of it. It is a question now which needs to be solved, whether our modern Sunday-school system, as now organized, is competent to grapple with this formidable enemy set in and often transforming itself into an angel of light,—whether, after all, the work must not be done in the "home," where the mental, moral and spiritual life is to be educated and trained. Here is an institution, possessing a power, a force lodged in its bosom by God Himself, which lies in the scheme for man's restoration, by which, when employed in the fear of God, this fallen nature is to be lifted up, the mental, moral and spiritual life educated, fitting the subject for his position in society, and preparing him for his duties here and for eternal blessedness in the hereafter, for which the soul was formed. A high end and a solemn duty! This is God's plan; it is the ordering in His economy for attaining important ends. And who will deny that precisely here lies the lever by which our fallen life is to be lifted, and that the family is the place where, and in which may be secured what is withheld in other relations in life. What a page in the history of the church, even during the "dark and dreary period" of the middle ages, that is, in which this divine institution was guarded so sacredly, .and from which such glorious results flow. The honor of invading it was reserved for our nineteenth century, to our selfish philosophy which makes marriage a "contract," the family a place where several persons herd together until they become tired of each other, or see proper to annul the bargain and change their way of living.

What now is the relation of our modern Sunday-school system to this scheme?

Let us keep distinctly this scheme, as set forth, before the mind, as well as this fact, that this modern idea of the Sunday-school was not in vogue in former years. And yet in those days there were Christians too, and there was the institution of the Christian family also, unless it would be insisted, foolhardily, that our forefathers "worshiped they knew not what." In the order of Christian doctrine, as embodied in the Heidelberg Catechism, there are fifty-two lessons, one for every Lord's day, and these several parts were for the membership of the Church, including the baptized membership. It is beyond controversy that the scheme of redemption, the plan for the restoration of our fallen nature, as set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism, was designed to root itself in the family life—that the baptized member was to be brought into contact with it by faithful, parental instruction, having been elevated to this plane in and by the covenant made with God in holy baptism. Born first in the bosom of the Christian family, on the ground of which there was a solemn covenanting with God, from thence to the school, and then a full ratification of these holy vows, and finally to the triumphant home in heaven. In this view life was invested with great realities and intense meaning and earnestness. And it is a strange problem to follow towards solution when another philosophy supplanted this Christian one, invaded the home, separated the relations sacramentally united, brought ridicule and contempt upon this ancient method, in which the scheme for the redemption of our fallen nature developed itself, and the child thrust out and argued into the uncovenanted mercies of God, and then felt itself constrained to use all ingenuity and skill, whereby to contrive a plan or scheme to take its place. This we have in the scheme or system styled new measures, new, in opposition to the one hoary with years. It repudiates grace in baptism, ignores this plane to which the child is lifted, but takes it up as it finds it in nature, and converts it. The two schemes are not the same. One stands, we conceive, in the plane of nature, the other far above it, in grace. And now, does not the Sunday-school system stand to a great extent, in this new theory? What else can you infer from the oft-repeated expressions occurring in the Sunday-school speeches at conventions of the many conversions taking place in the Sunday-school, and not one word of an ingrafting into Jesus Christ on the ground of which all that may have place. So the programme for Sunday-school Conventions, "the best method for the conversion of Sunday-school children," or "the best methods of teaching children to reach their conversion." This old educational plan or scheme is never touched upon, and if it would be brought up and advocated in detail, in any of the Sunday-school conventions, it would be branded as a relic of by-gone days, covered still with rags and tinsel from popery. Any one can see that between the schemes there is no parallel. From the position in which the system is, we affirm that the Sunday-school stands in a relation external to the Church, in whose bosom the Christian family has its home. In the days of Robert Raikes it was not the design nor the intention of occupying the field the Sunday-school has since taken in modern days. Its commencement had reference more particularly to the ignorant of neglected districts, and had for its object their education. It did not contemplate to take the baptized lambs in a congregation, who were under the care of the Christian family and of faithful pastors, and to do the work which was specially allotted to them. Neither is the assembling of these lambs with the members of the congregation, on a Sabbath afternoon, to study the catechism, to learn the doctrines of religion, of the same character or order as our modern Sunday-school. That was all legitimate, and the work of instruction differed widely from this modern system. The fact is they are not parallel. That stood in the broad order of the Church, this does not.

Standing in this relation, it takes and usurps the functions belonging to the home, the family, by attempting the work of Christian education, which belongs peculiarly to the family. But it will be replied, that the family fails in its mission, and better this, than allow children to grow up without moral and Christian training, to which it may be answered that this is so, precisely because this old order is practically disregarded, and now another scheme has been quietly allowed to take its place. If our position, previously advanced, be correct, then the family is the sphere and form in which the work is to be done, and no Sunday-school system can take its place. And no teaching nor instruction can be of the order and force as that which you find in the family. The work is carried on by persons, irrespective of the family, and whatever may be its faithfulness and solemn earnestness, it can never take the place of the father or mother in the Christian family. As it is now, who does not know that it has virtually usurped the place of the family, and that more stress is laid upon it, in this form, than upon the family? No; the old scheme carried forward during the week by the pious father or mother amounted to far more and produced results far greater than any under the working of this new system, though the agents may be pointed at and sneeringly spoken of as "unconverted, petrified fossils." But we let the magnificent, silent monuments which that order of life has reared in the schools, colleges, seminaries and churches speak for itself and refute the slander.

Standing in this relation the system makes little account of the order in which we find the Christian family, and hence little of the plans as held and taught by it. In reading the speeches made at Sunday-school conventions, with here and there a small oasis, you do not meet with a single syllable recommending and enforcing this old, ancient scheme. The burden is the conversion of children, with the evident confused idea of what conversion really is. It often shows a wretched theology, mixing together terms and so facts which a sound theology will ever keep separate. An instance we have in the terms regeneration and conversion. Regardless of this, the work is all carried on irrespective of this wonderful world found in the bosom of the family. Speak of the church of Jesus Christ, the Mystical Body of the Lord, and ears are already set. Say that a child born in nature is, by baptism, by water and the Spirit born into this Mystical order, and you begin to offend pious ears. Affirm that this divinely implanted life is nursed and nurtured in the bosom of the Christian family, and not in the Sunday-school, and that here, by the guiding Spirit of God, in the hands of the parent, this implanted life is drawn out, and that it gradually grows to its proper growth for the recognition of this relation into which by baptism it was brought, and so to full membership in the church, where the soul is fully moulded, fashioned, trained for the responsible duties of life and prepared for heaven, and you tread on ground suspected, and by our modern philosophy persistently repudiated. The system makes no practical account of this divinely instituted plan, and consequently occupies a relation to it, to a great extent external, and without a question we have here one of the reasons why Sunday-schools prove inadequate to the work they undertake, and why the burden of the Sunday-school speeches often is the want of success in housing the great mass of the young and rising generation. Our modern philosophy which requires everything to be so thin as to be perfectly transparent, which will acknowledge no grace in the divinely instituted mysteries, which looks upon the Church as a figment and the sacraments as unmeaning ceremonies, is disposed to work outside of this order and attempt the regeneration of this fallen nature on a plane purely natural. It is an attempt to work outside of the established order and effect that which is forever married to the heavenly, and as a consequence proves its own insufficiency and weakness. This becomes stil clearer from the fact that the system is indefinite in its aims and its efforts. In our divided Protestantism, where the spirit of individualism is ever at hand, and where each person is his own king and lord, in matters of faith, the platform on which the system stands must be exceedingly broad. As a consequence, societies have been formed with a basis so broad and liberal as to be able to accommodate the various shades and phases of religious belief, obtaining in the different denominations entering them. Here we have "a meeting together on a platform and shaking hands with each other." In order to see and feel the indefiniteness of the systems thus represented, let any one take up the Question Books published, as for instance those by the American Sunday-school Union, to study the word of God, and they will find them indefinite and unsatisfactory. The truth is, they must be made general, they must not insist on doctrines which are peculiar, but must be toned down so as not to give offence. Only think of a question book constructed in the interest of Calvinism, or Arminianism. But if either of these views is necessary to a proper understanding of the word of God and of the plan of redemption, why should they not be taught the child and inserted in these books? If the word of God distinctly teaches that grace is conferred in holy baptism and that the subject is thus, by the Spirit of God, born "into the kingdom," why should not the fact be unequivocally taught? But now, any one acquainted with the facts in the case, knows that this would be utterly impossible, that no question book could be constructed teaching these doctrines. Then, too, if you look into the Sunday-school literature which now floods the land, your conviction becomes strengthened. In many instances it is the merest trash, there is stuff palmed off on the unwary which is unworthy the name and absolutely dangerous to be put into the hands of children. Take for instance the stories of good little children, a few years old, who, in skilful hands become heroes in the sphere of religion, whose experience and life would compare well with the old veterans who passed through trial and persecutions and obtained the martyr's crown, and in them you find not one word as to the manner by which they came to the plane on which these heroic deeds only were possible, but everything is in the sphere of nature where these great deeds are done. How simply absurd and pernicious, and how utterly indefinite the whole case becomes. This indefiniteness has made itself felt, and as a consequence nearly all the denominations have established societies of their own, have procured question books to suit their own individual wants, and by which it is expected to do the work in a definite and precise form. The same is true also of the literature. Vast preparations have been made by which to furnish Sunday-school literature suitable to the wants of individual denominations, and this work is still going on and will go on, no doubt, until every one has his own apparatus to carry forward its own individual, peculiar idea of religion and duty to the young. Whether it is right or wrong we stop not to decide, it is simply a matter of fact, and what the result will be we know not: one thing is clearly demonstrated by it, that the system now in vogue is proving itself insufficient and indefinite, and a want is created for something definite upon which reliance may be placed for accomplishing what hitherto proved unfruitful. The feeling is becoming more general that the work must be kept within the pale of the Christian church, —that the work must be definite—that there must be no toning down, yea, there are signs of returning to the old landmarks, of coming back to the old, tried system of educational religion, as it held in the bosom of the Christian family and then instructed for full membership in the church. May the Lord speed the time.

What is now the proper relation of the Sunday-school to the church?

We do not wish to be understood as having any hostility to the Sunday-school, nor to suppose that the organization has not a proper place. But it never can take the place of the family; it is unequal for that task and never can do its work. It is out of its order and province. What we need in our day of skepticism, is to have society and the young indoctrinated with true, genuine Christian truth, and especially to have the institution of the family restored to its proper place and let it do its work. It is a lamentable fact that the vast majority of the young grow up without any or at least little religious training. It is all material, and the danger is that this modern "no religion" will become general, and that instead of the great Christian nation we are represented to be (though intensely false) we shall soon be a nation of rationalistic skeptics.

In order to bring about this millenial day the sentiment of the people must change, the Christian Church must have her proper position and place. Her divinely ordained means must be recognized and acknowledged as channels through which grace comes; the Christian family must be restored to its proper place in the bosom of the church; our infidel idea of marriage flung to the winds, and the old scheme fully instituted accepted and lived out. The first step in this moral regeneration must be the restoration of the Christian family to its proper place. There must be the apprehension of the powers of the world to come, that the regeneration of society is accomplished by these powers carried in the bosom of the church, and that our modern efforts to raise society are hopeless and vain. The poisonous leaven so widely diffused in society that education is the great lever by which to raise fallen nature, that no divine power is needed in the way of grace lifting to the plane where the work is carried on, this leaven must be counteracted and a better one imparted. Let the Christian family once more take its place; let it be a home in which the Spirit of God dwells, under whose guidance the child, born into its warm bosom, is spiritually born again by water and the Spirit; let the quiet, silent, but powerful, influence of this home-life. guided by the Spirit, do its work; let it be, as of old, the sacred sphere for doing this great work, and it will be difficult to see what necessity there exists for such an organization as our modern Sunday-school system. Indeed the field is all taken up; every part of it is tilled, and what is more the work is better done than any other order or scheme can do it." . . . . How does a little child receive the kingdom of Heaven? On the answer to it depends that other question, How shall you be saved yourself? . . . . In the Great Awakening he* mentions as a thing quite out of the course not only of nature, but of grace, the story of a little girl four years old, who passed in successive stages through all the phases and symptoms of a religious experience, as those symptoms were laid down by the doctors of that day; from carelessness to seriousness, from seriousness to gloom, from gloom to despair, and then (after a sufficient interval) from despair to joy and peace in believing; and the good man tells the story with the evident conviction that that was the regular and only correct way for a little child to enter the kingdom of heaven, but that it was not much to be expected that many of them would come by that course.

Alongside of this story let me put another of a different sort, but illustrating the same point. One of the most eminent and beloved of the pastors of New York city was telling me, in a little confidential circle of brethren, the beautiful story of his Christian experience; how with the earliest dawn of reflection he became conscious of a deep, tender love for God his Father and Christ his Saviour; how this feeling grew with his childish growth and strengthened with his strength; how in later years there were variations and fluctuations of feeling, and crises of religious experience, which had made him suspect that at such or such a time he was converted, and first began to be a Christian; but how, as his knowledge and experience had grown, he had settled clearly in the conviction that if ever he had known the grace of God, he had known it from the time of those earliest recollections. A few days after this I met the venerable father of my friend on Broadway, and told him that his son had been telling me the story of his religious life. "Oh no, he hasn't," said the good old man; "he can't remember that story. Only his mother and myself can tell it. It goes back to his cradle!" Who will undertake to say at what point such a life may not be begun by the inworking of the Holy Spirit? *

---

* **Jonathan Edwards.**

We are aware that great zeal has been displayed in carrying forward the work of the Sunday-school, but now, if the same effort were made, the same zeal displayed to raise up and to restore the family to its legitimate place in the bosom of the church who, but one incredulous, would not say that the result would be greater and nobler? Here is the lever by which the lifting of this fallen nature is to be effected, as an institution divine, and it is sad to see how far it has been surrendered and attempts made to substitute something else in its stead. To say anything now against this reigning spirit, to undertake to restore this old educational theory of religion, to put the family where long before it had place, is, in our day, like rowing against wind and tide, and would be sure to draw down upon you the suspicion of the "converted" and consider you an old, unconverted fossil of some long by-gone age. As

---

* Address by Rev. L. W. Bacon, at Sunday-school Convention held in Baltimore Dec., 1870.

matters now stand, with the licentious spirit so fearfully prevalent in the world, the work is rapidly accumulating, and there is no wonder that the friends of children, the friends of the Sunday-school, are urgent in the appeals which they make to the Christian public to take hold of the work and assist in rescuing society from dissipation and vice. And it is to be feared with each advancing tide, that the work will become more alarming, the means of arresting it feebler, and that, possibly, general anarchy and ruin may follow. What a fertile field lies open here where a rich harvest may be reaped by those "princes of Sunday-school superintendents" hailing from Washington City, commencing with our Congressmen and State Legislators, generally fit subjects, and gathering them into the fold.

But now apart from this, where there is a call for the Sunday-school for gathering together the spiritually unhoused children in order to save them for society, the proper place for this work is to bring it under the full control and power of the church. We are aware, too, that this idea is steadily pushed into the background, these subjects must be first converted. In our modern system, no church is needed to do this great moral, spiritual work, and in conformity to this, schools are often organized and carried on independently of church or congregation, at times by superintendents and teachers who are non-professors of religion. The great thing is to organize schools into which to gather the children of a neighborhood, in which you have no positive religious training, where there is a general ignorance of the first principles of religion, and these schools often become the occasion for immense gatherings, are often the means of keeping church members (where there are any to take part) from the ordinary, stated means of grace, and very often become positively pernicious and the source of vast mischief to communities. Far better would the children be at home in the "home," the family, and in this divine school be taught the Catechism and the simple truths of the Christian religion, sure seed for a rich, future harvest.

We state again, that we have no hostility to the Sunday-school system, as such, but believe that its proper place is where it is under the control of the Church, and then only as an auxiliary, and in no possible way can it ever or may it take the place of the Family and attempt to do its work. Where the Sunday-school is called in then, it should stand in this warm bosom, and there should be a distinct teaching of the doctrine of the Bible as held and taught by the proper Church Confession. In our sadly divided and distracted Protestantism, the only safety is, to be true to the Confession borne along by the denomination. It is no doubt clear that not any one, to the exclusion of all others contains the truth. Let every confession then work out its assigned problem—let that which is worthy of being saved be carefully gathered up and preserved and let the rest go overboard and thus, grasping the truth, carefully saved, may there then not be a looking forward to the time when these various denominational forms now prevailing will be resolved into thin air and carried away, and the glorious one Church of the future loom up to fill the world. In order to this we want no mid-way instruction, no toning down of Christian doctrine, but the pointed personal truth of the Word of God, as it is understood, not by the outside world, such as non-professing teachers, but as understood by the Confession under whose shadow the school may stand. But even with all this advantage, it must be felt that it is but a poor substitute for the Christian family. In the condition into which society has been brought, it may possibly be the best that can be had, under the circumstances. One thing is certain, and it would be well to look the fact steadily in the face, in order to reach the end proposed by the Sunday-school, the youthful mind, before the subject is conscious, must be fed and so forward be filled with positive, direct truth. The heart must be indoctrinated—the seed must be sown and it matters little whether the mind or heart can grasp the force or meaning of the truth taught, so that it be there, the rest will come by and by. But in our day, with the theory of religion, now generally prevailing,—a theory which relies on conversion (much abused word), there is in reality no plane upon which the natural heart is to be be lifted for the work. It lays hold upon the natural heart, manipulates it by appliances equally natural, and at last complains of the want of success and wonders why so few conversions take place among the children in the Sabbath-school. In our day, as all know, a large proportion of the young in communities, are out of full membership in the Church, though many are baptized, and are awaiting, what they call conversion, And it is not so far in the past, when in communities, under the old educational system of religion, non-professors were the exception, and nearly all stood in full membership with the Church. We are aware that these communities were looked upon as unconverted, and the intensely converted, yearning for true, genuine converted souls, sent missionaries to these benighted people to convert them. Their monuments, however, in their splendid Churches,—their faithful attendance on the means of grace,—their schools and seminaries, their morals in general refute the stale slander.

No. Let the child, born into the family, be covenanted with God. If in the hand of a Sunday-school teacher let it be told of this blessed, sacred advantage. Let it be early taught the sacred relation in which it stands—let it know of its covenant, that it may be confidently asked, "What is *thy* only comfort in life and in death?" Let it be taught that there is a difference between the covenanted and uncovenanted one, and on this sphere or plane it can be indoctrinated—be taught to value highly its baptismal vows—that they have, for it great significance, looking forward to full membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, the true home in which the soul finds peace, with the certain and blessed assurance of finding everlasting rest in the Church triumphant in heaven.

Art. VI.—THE LESSONS OF THE CHURCH YEAR NOT A PERVERSION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

By the Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D.

To the Ancient Lessons of the Church Year the objection has been made that the Gospel and Epistle must, in some cases, be taken in a sense which modifies or changes the evident meaning of the inspired Author. The import of the selected passage viewed from the stand-point of the writer and in its relation to the entire scope of the particular book to which it belongs, is one, whilst the sense of the passage as the lesson for a given Sunday, when viewed in the light of the Church Year and in its relation to the Lessons of the preceding and succeeding Sundays, is another. We get thus two meanings. The one is conveyed by the inspired writer; the other is put into the passage by the Church. This, it is thought, involves a perversion of Holy Scripture; or if not a perversion, at least an unwarrantable degree of freedom, and an abuse of Scripture.

This objection like some others, has been urged in a plausible form; and, among the influential writers of the present age, by the celebrated Reformed Theologian, Dr. Ebrard; who, however, nevertheless concedes the wisdom and propriety of the Pericopes as an order and basis of the preaching of the Gospel.

Were the Scriptures identical and commensurate with the Gospel, or were the Scriptures the only true and legitimate form of presenting and proclaiming the Gospel, the objection would be relevant and valid. But when we bear in mind that the books of the New Testament, though written by inspired men and thus the true standard of the Christian Faith and the authoritative source of Christian knowledge, are nevertheless merely the original, and therefore not the exclusive, but only one complex form in which the mysteries of the Faith are set forth and taught, the force of the objection must disappear.

The books of the New Testament, when viewed as now collected and arranged, or when taken in their chronological order, are not and do not claim to be a logically connected whole. Every author writes for a special purpose which is more or less general as the circumstances may require, but it is not absolutely general. He does not contemplate, immediately, all the needs of the Church, practical and theoretical, in every stage of her history throughout all the ages to come; and then write with a direct reference to those general and comprehensive needs. Every one writes too for his special purpose independently of all the rest, being moved by the same Spirit, who divideth to every man severally as He will. Yet moved by the manifestations of the Spirit, he presents his own view of Christ and His salvation; and this view is freely shaped by his peculiar psychological habit and personal character, and conditioned besides by the particular circumstances of the Church to which he is addressing himself. The human, modified by concrete inward and outward relations, is in its measure a positive factor of the written production, as really as the divine.

No writer, however, presents his own view of the *whole* Christian revelation. He teaches a part of the Gospel, or some elements of it; or he exhibits the Gospel under some one given aspect or from one particular point of observation. There is indeed order and continuity of thought in every book, or nearly so: and in some, close logical reasoning and profound argument, as in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. But no author aims at setting forth the Gospel in its entire rounded fullness. Nor does he present a system of the objective truth. A systematic view of the Gospel of Christ, as a whole, is not to be found in any one book, nor in all the books taken together of any one author.

This negative view of the Scriptures calls for no argument. That the New Testament contains no systematic presentation of the Gospel, or that the outward form in which the truth is taught in these inspired books is not as such a complete picture of the living Gospel, is now generally conceded by theologians, as well by those who do not as by those who do emphasize the broad difference between the objective Gospel and the New Testament record. This fact does not, however, as some might imagine, invalidate or weaken the fundamental truth that Holy Scripture is the touchstone of Christian teaching and the unchangeable norm of a theological system. On the contrary, it serves rather to sustain and confirm this truth.

If we consider the Scriptures only from the stand-point of a scientific system, every single book assumes the character of a fragment, and the New Testament becomes a confused collection of fragments. But if we consider the Scriptures in their internal and organic relation to the objective Gospel; and every book in its connection with the life and character of its author, and with the time, place and circumstances for which it was written, no book is a fragment, nor are the canonical Scriptures an incomplete production; but the written word assumes a totally different character. It appears as a real unity, a living plant; and the entire New Testament, no matter what may be the external arrangement of its parts, confronts our faith as the blooming Paradise of God, where the infinite fullness, the order, harmony and beauty of the new creation reign supreme.

The author standing in the bosom of the new life, and writing under manifestation of the Spirit for a specific purpose produces a concrete work. The production is, so to speak, an individuality, that stands for itself amid the group; and is rooted not in a system of religious doctrines, but in the objective mystery of grace. The relation which it bears to the others is not outward, nor logical, nor abstract; but, what is more profound and real, it is inward, and dynamic, and concrete. Growing forth from the whole life of the Gospel, it carries and embodies this general life in itself; but it does this under a particular and definite outward form. As the true, eternal and infinite God was manifested in Jesus of Nazareth, who, although He was the second Adam and the Head of the new race, was also a real individual man, so does the infinite fullness of supernatural revelation as consummated in the resurrection and glorification of Jesus Christ, underlie, pervade and pulsate in every inspired book; yet the character of every book is truly human, as much so as if it were not inspired by the supernatural power of the Gospel, but were human only. This human character it derives from the individual life of the author, from the moral, social and historical attitude of the times, and from the specific circumstances of the Church to which the book is adapted. The production is thus in the proper sense real and historical. It is adapted specifically to its own age; and, when considered under this aspect it is adapted in the same sense to no other age in the subsequent history of the Church.

Hence the several books differ widely from one another; and they differ so peculiarly that it is difficult if not impossible to classify them satisfactorily according to any scientific principle of division. The Gospel of St. John is unique; so is the Epistle to the Hebrews, and The Book of Revelation. A classification can at most be only approximate.

But this singular difference is organic, not mechanical. One book differs from another as the oak from the fir, and the fir from the box. These are so many specific actualizations of one and the same general life of the vegetable kingdom. In like manner are these independent books related to the infinite life of the Gospel. Their unity and harmony stand not in the domain of thought, but in the domain of existence; not in an abstract system, but in a living constitution. Conditioned objectively by the real presence in the spirit of a new order of existence, and mediated subjectively by the communion and apprehension of faith, they are each one a single divine-human product; a product of inspiration and of individual apprehension, of inwrought supernatural power and of truly natural forces and relations; a product therefore that possesses, in one respect, a permanent, and in another, only a transient value and importance. Looking at the books of the New Testament under this two-fold aspect, that is, in their internal relation to the new creation in Christ and in their human character,—we may see what is and what is not a perversion of the Gospel; also, what is and what is not a perversion of Holy Scripture.

Fidelity to the Gospel is not identical with fidelity to the Scriptures. Internally and organically connected, and never to be sundered, these forms of fidelity are nevertheless to be clearly distinguished. Fidelity to the Gospel and fidelity to the Scriptures, cannot contradict each other when both are genuine. The one includes the other. The minister who is faithful to the teachings of the written word in the broad, free spirit of the Gospel is so far forth faithful to the Gospel itself. But there is a false as well as a true fidelity to the Scriptures; a fidelity that perverts the Gospel and violates the free spirit that reigns in the books of the New Testament. There is a certain kind of narrow, literalistic fidelity which is no better than Pharisaic bondage to the letter. Such fidelity, so far from being true to the life of the Gospel, in reality contradicts its nature and authority.

To illustrate the difference between the Gospel or the objective revelation, and the Scriptures, and the manner in which a supposed fidelity to the Scriptures may contradict the living truth of the Gospel, we will adduce several examples.

The decalogue enjoins the observance of the seventh day, and there is no record in the Old or New Testament of any formal abrogation of the commandment; and the Apostles for a number of years at least, observed the Jewish Sabbath as well as the festivals and fasts enjoined by the Mosaic law. But the Church has surrendered the Sabbatic rest as part of a superseded dispensation, and in its stead has substituted, as being demanded by the spirit of the Christian dispensation, the festival of the resurrection, celebrated on the first day of the week.

Our Lord was circumcised as well as baptized. He became a son of the law, according to Jewish custom, at the age of twelve years; observed the Passover and other Jewish festivals during His life and ministry, not nominally only and outwardly, but in the true spirit of the Mosaic economy, for He fulfilled "all righteousness." The Apostles, following the example of our Lord, did the same thing, not only before His crucifixion, but afterwards also. After the Christian Church was fully constituted by the coming of the Holy Ghost. they continued for many years to observe strictly these Jewish festivals, the Apostle Paul, the bold antagonist of the Judaizing tendency, and the firm advocate of Christian liberty, himself not excepted. (Acts xviii. 21.) Yet the universal Christian consciousness, Greek, Roman and Protestant, of what the Gospel itself is and requires of true believers, has superseded the zealous practice of inspired Apostles and the force of the Lord's own example; and this, too, in virtue of the new, broad, contra-judaizing life and spirit of the Gospel as taught in the writings of these Apostles themselves.

Our Lord, before He celebrated the feast of the Passover for the last time, washed the feet of His disciples and wiped them with the towel wherewith He had girded Himself. Then, when He was set down, He said unto them, "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." (John xiii. 1–17.) Yet in the Christian judgment of the Church, and agreeably to her practice, the Gospel does not demand outward conformity to His example, nor a literal fulfillment of His command.

The first council of Apostles, elders, and the whole Church, held at Jerusalem, decreed, after much disputing, that no greater burden be laid upon believing Gentiles than these necessary things; that they abstain, 1st. From meats offered to idols. 2d. From blood. 3d. From things strangled; and 4th. From fornication. Yet some of these prohibitive decrees have for ages been obsolete. Indeed only the fourth grows so necessarily out of the nature of Christianity that it is of permanent and universal obligation. The third, for example, declares it to be a *necessary* thing that believers abstain from things strangled. In the course of time, however, though established by the Apostolic Council under the guidance and direction of the Holy Ghost, this decree was superseded by the free spirit of the Gospel, and is now regarded as having no direct binding force on the conscience.* No minister of the Reformed Church would take this Apostolical decree as the basis of a sermon, and enforce the prohibitive requirement upon the consciences of his people, maintaining that it is a sin to eat the flesh of a snared rabbit.

---

* The Roman theory respecting the fixed and unchangeable character of dogmas, and the continuous authority of ecclesiastical decisions, is contradicted by her own practice relatively to the obsolete decrees of the Apostolic Council, than which no council possesses stronger claims to Christian confidence; for the Encyclical Letter states explicitly, It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things. Acts xv. 28.

Other instances illustrating the same general principle might be adduced. Indeed the outward, verbal form of the record would throughout serve the purpose of illustrating it. But these are sufficient. These facts show that, in spite of all abstract theories to the contrary, the intuitive sense of the living mind of the Church perceives the generic difference between the nature and spirit of the Gospel, and the letter or outward form of the written word. They show that in the actual history of the Church, fidelity and devotion to the Gospel are not the same as fidelity to the letter of Scripture, nor the same even as mechanical conformity to Apostolic practice and Apostolic decrees. They show that a slavish subjection to the external word of Holy Scripture, and subjection to the particular form of Apostolic practice and teaching that confronts us in the books of the New Testament, may involve a perversion of the Gospel; as this is an order of life in the world that generates and legitimizes forms of practice and teaching other than those which prevailed in the Apostolic age. The facts cited, moreover, illustrate the wide difference between the Gospel and the Scriptures, between the life of the Gospel and the letter of the Scriptures, without in the least degree contradicting the impregnable truth, that Jesus Christ and His salvation are the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever; and that Christianity being a real divine revelation is in itself true and whole, and therefore not susceptible of additions or improvements by the will and reason of men, nor by any supposed subsequent illumination or inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

This prevailing sense of difference between the Gospel and the particular form of the sacred record, manifests itself in the universal practice of the pulpit,—the practice which is commonly called *accommodation*. Ministers do not as a rule enforce that particular aspect of meaning which they find in the written word. It is not fit. The life of the Church has developed itself into a different character—the times have changed. Hence her wants as is seen and felt, are in many respects not the same as those which prevailed when the Apostles lived and wrote. The Scriptures cannot in consequence be used mechanically. The truths which they teach must be adapted to the present attitude of the Church. This principle every intelligent preacher of the Gospel perceives and acknowledges. He endeavors to adapt scriptural teaching to existing wants. Hence he instinctively searches for a meaning in the Scriptures which is not formally expressed; but which he believes underlies it or is involved in it. Many preachers even transcend these limits. They put a meaning of their own into the Scriptures which will serve their purpose; but which is not in the passage, nor justified by the context.

Is this practice of accommodation a perversion of the sacred Scriptures? We must answer in two ways.

We must answer in the affirmative. The practice perverts the Scriptures, and perverts the Gospel whenever it is arbitrary; whenever it is governed by the individual will, taste or fancy of the minister; or whenever, ignoring the supernatural mystery and order of grace, the accommodation proceeds from a point of observation that is foreign to the objective idea and spirit of the Gospel.

But we must answer also in the negative. The practice of accommodation does not involve a perversion of the Scriptures when, recognizing the living reality and the unchangeable nature of the Gospel, it is determined and properly governed by the Christian faith. Standing in the same objective faith in which the Apostles stood, the minister uses the written word of God in the light of the Spirit by whose inspiration it was indited, and for the same general purpose. But instead of being slavishly bound by the letter, he lays hold of the general truth which the letter teaches, and proclaims the truth in a way which the present posture, relations and circumstances of the Church require. Such a modification and adaptation of the written word is Scriptural. It accords both with the nature of the Gospel, and with the interior reigning spirit of the

Scriptures; the spirit which prompted the particular form in which they were written.

It is on this general evangelical principle that the order of the Church year proceeds. The Church uses the lessons not according to the letter only, which always kills; not simply according to the particular sense which a passage bears in its relation to the context, and the special purpose of the inspired writer; but according to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. Recognizing the objective general truth that obtained expression through Apostles in the peculiar language of the New Testament, the Church year appropriates suitable portions of the Scriptural text from the stand-point of this general truth, which is the same for the faith of the Church in every period of her history. In thus appropriating the Scriptural text to the purpose of teaching the Gospel, the original particular meaning gives place to a modified sense,—a sense which is developed from the passage taken in its relation to the entire order of grace, and adapted to the prevailing state of the Church and the world.

Such accommodation of the Scriptures to present needs, the Gospel itself necessitates and legitimizes. So far then from perverting them, the lessons of the Church year, when apprehended and enforced from the stand-point and in the spirit of the Gospel, guard the Scriptures against perversion, and conserve the faith which they teach. The lessons guide, aid and sustain the minister in proclaiming firmly the whole truth of revelation, in opposition to all the false demands of the age.

ART. VII.—THE STUDY OF METHOD IN MODERN CHURCH HISTORY.

CHURCH historians generally agree in recognizing three *Ages* in the history of the Christian Church, the Ancient, the Mediæval, and the Modern. Each of these ages has its own peculiar characteristics. The age of Primitive Christianity, reaching from the founding of the Church to the time of Gregory the Great, or, according to some historians, of Charlemagne, is the age of Christianity in the Græco-Roman Empire. It includes the subordinate periods of the Apostolic, the Persecuted, and the Established Church. To this age belong the founding of the Church on the day of Pentecost, the period of inspiration under the Apostles, the forming of the œcumenical creeds, the production of the primitive liturgies, the settlement of great fundamental doctrines, in all of which the universal Church, Roman, Greek, and Protestant, claims a common patrimony. "The first age presents the *immediate union of objectivity and subjectivity;* that is, the two great moral principles, on which the individual human life, as well as all history, turns, the *authority* of the general and the freedom of the individual, appear tolerably balanced, but still only in their first stage, without any clear definition of their relative limits."*

The Mediæval Age is the age of *Romano-Germanic Catholicism*, during which the Church occupies a new field and has under its tutelage new peoples. It has to do now not with ancient, classic, civilization, but with European barbarism. These new barbaric peoples, as they come upon the stage of history, as though summoned by an invisible power, were to be Christianized, and this gave rise to the great mission work of the Middle Age, under such leaders as Columbanus, Boniface, Ansgar and others. It was the age of new empires, the Franko-

---

* Schaff's Hist. Apostolic Church.

Roman, the German,—the age of the Crusades and Scholasticism, the age of convulsions and struggles, out of which came the Modern Age, with its new civilization, its established nationalities and its Protestant Church.

In the Mediæval Age " the principle of *objectivity* prevails. In the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages Christianity appears chiefly as law, as a pedagogical institution, a power from without, controlling the whole life of nations and individuals. Hence this may be termed the age of *Christian legalism*, of *Church authority.* Personal freedom is here, to a great extent, lost in slavish subjection to fixed, traditional rules and forms. The individual subject is of account, only as the organ and medium of the general spirit of the Church. All secular powers, the state, science, art, are under the guidance of the hierarchy, and must everywhere serve its ends."*

These first two ages of the Church have passed away, and we may study them now as something complete.

But when we come to study the modern age of the Church, ushered in by the Reformation, we meet a special difficulty. The age has opened and advanced through three centuries, *but it has not yet closed.* We have not yet reached an epoch which shall mark the transition to a new age. Such an epoch, according to the views of some of the deepest and most earnest thinkers of the age, is impending, it is already giving signs of its approach, as " coming events cast their shadows before." But it is not yet here. Until it shall have come, one of the conditions for a satisfactory comprehension of its meaning is wanting. It is often difficult to lay hold of the law or principle that controls the development of a period that lies in the past; for while in one view it is closed, yet in another view it forms a link in a larger age, and this again forms an integral part in the whole of history, looking to its ultimate end. No portion of history can be properly studied without an idea of that which constitutes its unity, and embraces its final conclusion. But in reference to the modern age of Christianity, or the Church, this difficulty is increased, as we have now seen, by the fact that the particular portion of history in which we stand is as yet in process of development, and therefore unclosed.

---

* Schaff's Hist. Apostolic Church.

Just here it is that the genius of the master historian is called into exercise, by which he is enabled to divine the future from the data of the present. There is a profound sense in which the future is always contained potentially in the present, and in which the end rules the beginning. Induction and speculation are both required here, as they are in all study of history or science,—speculation in order to lay hold intuitively of the ruling principles that lie back of the facts and phenomena, and induction, in order to aid in judging of the principles by the facts.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century formed an epoch in the history of the Church which included in itself a certain end toward which, as a beginning, it looked forward. It did indeed stand related to the past as well as to the future, and in this relation to the past it is more generally studied. We Protestants, at least, are accustomed to view it as the ripened fruit of the better life of the Middle Ages. It was on the one hand a *protest* against the errors and abuses that had crept into the Church during the preceding centuries, and on the other hand a rising to the solution of the problems that had been struggling in the mighty movements of the Mediæval Age. It was the assertion of the rights of the subject over against overwhelming objective authority, the assertion of a consciousness of more immediate communion of the individual believer with Christ, the attainment of higher certitude and freedom, the revival of letters, the overthrow of scholasticism, and the beginning of new scientific methods. In short, it was the beginning of new historical forces that have asserted their power and predominance in the last three centuries. All this it is not difficult to read.

But when we come to ask the question, to what conclusion does all this tend? we are brought face to face with the *problem of method* in interpreting Modern Church History. We do not mean to assert, of course, that no progress can be made in studying this period of history without a clear knowledge of its conclusion. That would be to say we cannot study the history of the present at all without supernatural prophetic knowledge. But it will be found that all the methods proposed by Church historians for the study of the Modern Period, that make any pretension to a scientific character, do involve some theory as to the future. How indeed can it be otherwise if we regard history as an organic process? How can we give any rational explanation of one stage of progress if we do not take in the one into which it is to merge in the future? This will appear from a notice of some of the divisions of modern Church history, in which the methods of the different authors are revealed. In our notice of these our object is not to propose any theory of our own, but rather to indicate what the study of method here involves. This we regard as important, for while, in one view, method may be regarded as only a help to the scientific study of history, in another view it will be found to be of central and vital significance.

I. Let us take first the method or theory that is based upon the relation of the objective and subjective factors of our Christian life. According to this we have in the first age of Christianity the *immediate union of objectivity and subjectiviy*, in which the authority of the general and the freedom of the individual appear tolerably balanced, but still only in their first stage, without any clear definition of their relative limits. Undoubtedly there are two such sides of Christianity, the objective and the subjective, as there are of our life in its original natural constitution. "The generalc haracteristic of the human mind in Antichristian, and particularly in Hellenic antiquity, may be described as its comparatively unreflecting belief in its own harmony and of its oneness with nature. The sense of an opposition, as existing either among its different functions and interests or between the mind and nature and as needing reconciliation, is as yet relatively undeveloped."*

---

* Ueberweg's Hist. Philosophy.

The life of the child develops at first without a consciousness of the objective law and the relation to it of its own will, until the consciousness is awakened by parental authority, and passes into the stage of willing and free reconciliation. If we recognize this as a law in the development of history, and of human life universally, it is reasonable that Christian history, and Christian life in the new creation should conform to it also.

According to this law of development, then, we are to interpret the Middle Age as the period during which the Church began to become conscious of the distinction between the two factors of its life, and during which the objective factor, as authority and law, Church and sacraments, became predominant. This certainly does give us a key to unlock the mystery of Mediæval history and to explain its facts.

According to this Hegelian theory of dialectic antithesis, the Reformation came as a reaction on the part of the subjective factor, the assertion of individual freedom, the exaltation of personal faith,—a reaction which reached out, indeed, into all departments of life, originating new methods in science and philosophy, and giving a new turn to the whole current of history.

There can be no question that subjectivity and individuality do come to an assertion in the Reformation as they had not done in any previous age of the Church. This appears in the proclamation both of the material and the formal principle of Protestantism. The doctrine of justification by faith which Luther preached stood, indeed, in antithesis with the doctrine of justification by works, but it carried in it the assertion of conscious direct communion with God, such as had been lost sight of in the experience of preceding times. It was a struggle for more immediate and direct certitude as to man's acceptance with God, a certitude, which did not stop with the *dictum* of the Church, but through this recognized in more immediate power the presence of God in the soul. In regard to the rule of faith also the disposition was, not to rest in the uncertainty of a floating tradition, but to go to the inspired Scriptures. These were now brought forward as a common depository for all Christians, and all were to use these Scriptures for edification.

The movement in religion was accompanied by a corresponding movement in the sphere of thought. With the revival of letters philosophy entered upon a new career. It also sought for some ground of certitude that would render it free from mere external authority. In the age of Scholasticism philosophy had been only a tool for theology, it had no recognized independent rights. Now the mind, as though freed from a sort of nightmare, sets vigorously to work in the line of independent investigation. Bacon leads the way in one line, Descartes in another. Both seek to find the ground of our knowledge. Modern philosophy as it moves onward, reveals many faults and weaknesses, but it reveals also amazing strength. But whether strong or weak it reveals the presence of the same tendency to subjectivity and individualism that we find in the sphere of religion.

Now, if we adopt this theory, we will interpret certain movements in Modern Church history according to it. The rise of Puritanism, and afterwards Methodism, are results of this subjective tendency, pushed, it is true, somewhat to an extreme. The revolutions in England, France, and America will reveal the same tendency, a desire for freedom and independence. It does not alter the case that in some instances, as the French Revolution, much infidelity and wickedness were mingled in the movement. The tendency reveals itself, but it is good or bad according as it is under the power of a good or evil spirit.

Adopting this theory, we are prepared to find the weakness, as well as the strength, of Protestant tendencies. As in the Middle Ages the other factor was predominant, and as a consequence the development was one-sided, so now, in the ascendency of the subjective factor, we may expect excesses and extremes, a want of regard for authority, a want of faith in the objective constitution and power of Christianity, and as a result the excrescences of fanaticism and sectarianism. The facts confirm this view. Beginning with the Anabaptist, we have a regular line of fanaticism, reaching down through pietism, in its various grades, and breaking out in the revivals, as was the case in this country in the time of Whitefield, and in the terrible excesses in Kentucky and Tennessee, about the close of the eighteenth century. Breaking loose from the external unity and authority of the Papacy, the spirit of independence runs out into the leanest sort of sectarianism. Division after division takes place, secession after secession, until we reach what used to be called the "tip end of orthodoxy," in some little sect of two or three congregations, yet filled with self-importance in inverse ratio to its smallness of size. Here we see the weakness of Protestantism; but however ridiculous some of the wild pranks of this subjective tendency appear, they are really not worse in this respect than some of the attitudes of the Papacy during the Middle Ages.

We see also what is to be the corrective for this one-sided tendency of Protestantism. The course of Christian history must tend towards a synthesis, in which these two factors will come into harmonious union. Meanwhile we can interpret spasmodic movements of Churches, as the Puseyite movement in England, which sought to find a remedy for the evil by attempting to go back to the position of primitive Christianity, and also of individuals, who impatient and despairing of help, cut the Gordian knot by lapsing into the arms of Romanism. We can see the meaning of the better tendencies in Romanism and Protestantism looking to a positive advance, in which old things shall pass away and all things become new.

II. Passing from this general theory of the relation of the objective and subjective factors in the constitution of Christianity, if we desire to enter more directly upon the study of the history of Protestantism, we may employ the same principle of a dialectic process as applied to the two principles of Protestantism, the Material and the Formal, as they are called. In tracing the operation of these two principles, we are to regard them, not as a dualism, but as holding in the one common principle of Christianity. They must have such an inward unity, else they would end only in antagonism and confusion.

During the Reformation these two principles were held in equipoise, although even then already there were manifestations of a disposition to separate them. The work of antagonizing Romanism so absorbed the interest of the Reformers that they were constantly compelled, now to hold up faith over against works as the condition of man's justification, now to appeal to the Sacred Scriptures as the only rule of faith over against uncertain, floating tradition.

But no sooner had Protestantism entered upon its independent career than these two principles began to stand out in their separate character, and in polar relation. In the first period after the Reformation, we have *orthodox*, *confessional and scholastic Protestantism;* in the second *Subjective and Negative Protestantism;* and in the third, *Positive preparation for a new age.*

Let us examine this division. It is substantially the same that Dr. Dorner employs in his history of Protestant Theology.

In the first period the Formal principle was in the ascendant. It is easy to see how Protestantism would first naturally turn its attention to the settling of its confessions, and how the study and discussions of theologians would centre around these. Christianity came to be regarded as having its essence in sound doctrine. The agency of the Holy Spirit in interpreting the truth was gradually pushed into the back-ground, and the written word was at the same time the truth and the interpreter of the truth.

Thus in the intellectualism of *Pajonism*, on the Reformed side, we have the theory pressed forward that *the agency of the word* is all that is needed. "In this, when favored by external circumstances, a logically moral efficacy is inherent, apart from the agency of the Holy Spirit. The will, according to *Pajon*, is entirely dependent upon knowledge, nothing is required but the knowledge of the truth, and this is secured by the word, without any direct reference to the Holy Spirit. Such operations of grace as he admits he transfers to Holy Scripture. The Holy Ghost has abdicated His agency to the word.*

So also the theory of inspiration set forth by the two Buxtorffs of Basle. If the written word is itself the revelation of God, instead of the record of that revelation, then the words and letters of the Scripture must be inspired. "The elder Buxtorff insisted upon the authorship of the sacred writers, in the case of the vowel points, as the safest view, but the younger gave a more decidedly doctrinal turn to the matter, by making this necessary to the inspiration of Holy Scriptures, and the *Form. Consens. Eccles. Helvet.* (1676) gave symbolical authority to the view, that the Hebrew codex, according to both its consonants and vowels or points, or, at all events, according to the signification of the points, was inspired by God,—a view which immediately found hearty acceptance in the Lutheran Church also."*

---

* Dorner's Hist. Prot. Theology.

The character of the English apologetics during the spread of Deism in that country reveals the same tendency. Christianity came to be identified with the written word. The Holy Scriptures needed confirmation, could be established by proof addressed to the reason, and on the success of this proof hung the truthfulness of Christianity. The two lines of proof were, that of *prophecy* and that of *miracles*. If it could be shown that the prophecies contained in the Old Testament were fulfilled in the New, the truth of the Scriptures was established; or if the miracles recorded in the New Testament, or the Old, could be established, then these Scriptures were the inspired revelation of God. The trial was brought before the bar of reason. In *Sherlock's* "*Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*," the case is brought forward after the manner of English courts of judicature, the judge (reason) is on the bench, the witnesses are summoned, examined and cross-questioned, the attorneys' arguments are made and decision rendered. What a parody this upon the formal principle of Protestantism! And what wonder that Deism should triumph when the defence of Christianity was made to occupy such ground!

In the Lutheran Church the same tendency prevailed. The Scriptures were regarded as the principle of theology, the assurance of salvation on the part of the believer, the *Testimo-*

---

* Dorner's Hist. Prot. Theology.

nium Spiritus S. of the Reformers was identified with assurance of the doctrines of the Bible, until at last this was dwindled down "into a recalling to memory of all those texts of the Bible, which prove, that our judgment concerning our adoption is according to truth, which judgment itself must again be based upon the fact that we have embraced pure doctrine." Thus we have the preparation for that abstract, mechanical, supernaturalism, which proved so weak before the spread of rationalism.

The reaction from orthodox-confessionalism and scholasticism came first in the form of pietism. A negative preparation for pietism had taken place in the formalism which brought dearth and death to vital piety. The people yearned for something to bring back to them some warmth and vigor in their religion. They could not live on orthodoxy or theology. Hence when Spener started his meetings, first at Frankfort on the Main, then at Dresden, where he was joined by Franke and Anton, and finally when the university was founded at Halle and became the great centre, pietism spread rapidly throughout the land. Indeed the movement preceded Spener, and he followed it, interposing his advice, and seeking to keep it from danger.

Pietism was a reaction called forth by the necessity for the assertion of the other Reformation principle, but it was itself one-sided and fanatical, and became the occasion then for the spread of rationalism. It was one of the antecedents of rationalism.

It is not our purpose to sketch the outline of rationalism nor trace its connection with the great philosophic systems that simultaneously arose, until in Schleiermacher a new beginning was made for theology and Church life in Germany. The age had passed beyond the stand-point of the old supernaturalism. Christianity came out now in the theological thinking as centering in the person of Christ, and apprehended by faith. The Scriptures from the time of Bengel were made the subject of criticism, and a distinction was made between the substance of revelation and the form of its record in the Scriptures. The nineteenth century brings us the regenerated theology of Germany, the recovery from subjective and negative Protestantism and the preparation for a new age. There is much confusion even yet in regard to the relation of these two principles. We have a Bibliolatry prevailing, and also fanaticism, but the age is moving towards an apprehension of the two in their unity. This at least is the theory of the course of history that sees, as does Dr. Dorner, such a dialectic process in the relation of these two principles of Protestantism.

The remedy for the error of adopting either one or the other of these principles solely must be found in a principle deeper than both and which yet makes room freely for both. This principle is the person of Christ—who is Himself the substance and life of Christianity. Although differently explained, yet since the time of Schleiermacher the theology of Germany has turned on this as the central principle in the Christian religion. To that great theologian belongs the credit of having brought out the idea that Christianity is not a doctrine or system of doctrine; not a cultus, or a discipline; but *a life.* This necessarily turned attention now to Christ, not merely as the agent of procuring man's salvation, but as being in His own person the source and substance of that salvation.

Resting in this principle, it is not difficult to make room for the two Protestant principles, and to hold them in their unity. Faith is the spiritual organ for receiving or appropriating the grace of Christ, and, therefore, it is only by faith that man can be justified. The mystical Christ must not be separated from the historical Christ. His birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension are the foundation of our holy religion. Hence we must embrace Christ by faith in this character, and therefore we must have witnessed to us the facts of His life. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me: and *ye* also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." (John xvi. 26). In this passage the order is stated. Christ is the substance of the divine revelation, the Holy Spirit bears testimony of Him in the heart, that is, enables man to apprehend the mystery by faith, and the witness of the disciples, the Holy Scriptures, is the form in which the revelation in Christ is recorded for our knowledge. But we cannot enter more at length upon this point. What is Christianity, in its essential nature? What is the relation of the person of Christ to the Spirit and the word in our salvation? These questions bring out the problem of centering the two Protestant principles in one deeper principle, while they at the same time assert their full power still against Roman error.

III. The position which Protestantism assumes in relation to the secular side of history.

Looking at the Reformation as an epoch of freedom in Church and State we might form our divisions of modern Church history by the course of history in general. The thirty years' war, the struggle in the Netherlands, the Revolution in England and the American and French revolutions, all these convulsions stand related to the religious movement of the Reformation. Viewing the Church, then, in relation to the work it is to accomplish in directing and guiding the interests of society at large, we get, according to some historians, the following divisions:

1. The period of supplanting ancient usages to the middle of the eighteenth century.
2. The overthrow of the existing state of things till 1814.
3. The renewal of the struggle in its most earnest form, and the commencement of an adjustment of affairs to the present.

Underlying this division is the principle or truth, that Christianity is a central force in history, and that it influences and controls the course of history in its universal character. Revolutions in the history of the Church go along with revolutions in the political and civil order of society, and often indeed with revolutions in nature itself; for the world is a unit, organically united by one life in all its parts, and what affects its central element, its religious life, must exert an influence also on all other departments. The civil wars that desolated Europe after the Reformation, especially the thirty years' war, were the outworkings of the religious convulsion that preceded them. The thirty years' war was a struggle between Romanism and Protestantism in the civil order, and its deepest meaning is to be found in this fact. When Romanism could not overthrow Protestantism in the religious contest, it sought to crush it out by the sword. The result was that Protestantism maintained its rights and privileges, and Romanism retained its existence also. Neither was to be blotted out. Both sides grew weary of the contest, and the peace of Westphalia closed the struggle, with a clearer understanding of the rights of each.

The American Revolution has its links of connection also with the principles of freedom advanced in the Reformation. We cannot conceive of the birth and successful growth of such a republic in any other age of the Church, at least not during the middle ages. The French revolution was a different affair, it occurred in a Roman Catholic country, it was the explosion, as from the crater of a volcano, of foul elements that had been festering in the life of the French nation. Corruption in the Church, the rise of an infidel philosophy, and a sort of blind fury, all wrought to bring on that fearful catastrophe. Yet underneath all this we may recognize the spirit of freedom that was begotten in the Reformation. France tried to follow America, but failed, and perhaps never will succeed until she becomes a Protestant nation.

The great Napoleonic wars also stand connected with the struggle with rationalism in Germany. Germany had yielded to the subtle enemy that came in upon her like a flood. Rationalism was poisoning all the fountains of a pure religion. A reaction was taking place. The true faith was asserting its power. But the transition seemed to need a bloody baptism, and it came in the Napoleonic wars. Germany was humbled, desolated, crushed. She arose from her humiliation in the dust with a firmer trust in God, and a purer faith. The third centenary of the Reformation witnessed the union of the rival confessions, the Lutheran and Reformed, in one evangelical Church. No one who acknowledges the deep central significance of religion in the life of a nation can fail to see the connection between the debauched Christianity of Germany and the scourge that came upon that nation through Napoleon. But when a second contest came under the *Second* Napoleon a few years ago, the result was very different. Germany had recovered her faith, her soldiers went to the field singing their Church hymns, and the result was that re-Christianized Germany came off victorious over degenerate France. Whether France will ever rise to a permanent prosperity until she throws off the incubus of ultramontane, Jesuitic Papalism, is a question which history must determine. The movements in France, Italy, and Spain, simultaneous with the declaration of the Vatican decree of Papal infallibility, afford a subject of study for those who see the intimate relation between the principles of Christianity and popular progress in the Modern Age. The question of Church and State comes in here again for reconsideration, and its new settlement will tell upon the course of history in Europe.

But for the Church historian the principle of division we have now been considering, must be of a subordinate character. In all such division the Church must be viewed as the main stream, the main factor. The movements outside in states and civilization can only come in for a secondary place. Yet they cannot be ignored, just as the secular and political movements of the Middle Ages must be studied in their relation to the progress of Christianity and the Christian Church.

IV. A fourth principle according to which we may study the history of the Church in modern times, is that which turns on *the relation between Christianity and the natural order as represented in philosophy and science.*

This principle falls under, or in with, the one just noticed. The State and social order constitute one side of our natural human life, philosophy and science another. Yet the principle here enunciated is of sufficient importance to challenge separate consideration. Let us endeavor to unfold it.

During the Middle Ages philosophy and science were held under slavish subjection by the Church. Theology ruled philosophy, and therefore we find in that period no independent philosophy. Scholasticism, which dealt mainly however in

Logic, used philosophy as a mere instrument to rationalize, so far as this was possible, the dogmas of the Church. Even science was dwarfed by the constant espionage exercised over it. The Church dictated in regard to the movement of the heavenly bodies, or at least claimed to sit in judgment upon the teachings of science here, just as she dictated in regard to her own proper doctrines.

It may be said that this is the proper relation. Christianity, as supernatural truth, must claim to furnish the key to the understanding of natural truth. Science without revelation gropes in the dark. Christ is the principle of all truth. How then can science or philosophy be true to itself if it does not acknowledge Christ as the light of the world? We grant all this. But the relation here must be free. Science cannot be forced into subjection to revelation. It must have a relative independence, in order to come to a willing recognition of the guidance of revelation.

In order now to transcend the old slavish position—philosophy must start out anew. We may then again find three periods:

1. Theology and philosophy standing independent of each other.
2. A struggle between them, rationalism and supernaturalism.
3. Tendency towards free reconciliation and union.

After the Reformation, we know, philosophy started on an independent career. The leaders in the movement were Bacon and Descartes, or perhaps more correctly, Locke and Descartes. In the case of each of these philosophers, the impulse was to reach certitude, to the fullest extent at least possible for reason. The one line of thinking tended towards materialism, the other towards rationalism, in England, deism became the error, in Germany, pantheism. But we will not anticipate.

What we notice first is the independent starting-point of modern philosophy. Take, for instance, the principle of Descartes. His object is to go back of all assumptions in order to start with necessary truth, such as is matter of knowledge without any doubt. In order to reach this beginning point he commences with doubting everything which he can doubt, and thus arrives at what no man can doubt, viz: the fact that he is thinking. So he gets his *cogito, ergo sum.*

In like manner, Bacon (rather in regard to science than to philosophy), seeks to rest knowledge on an independent basis. What can we know as certain, and what is the true method of establishing it on scientific principles? Locke, in like manner made a searching investigation of the human understanding, to ascertain the origin of our ideas. It matters not here whether the Baconian system, or that of Locke, is correct. They have both proved to be one-sided, if not false. And in the same way we may question whether Descartes made any advance from his premise to his conclusion,—whether in asserting "I *am* thinking" he did not already assert a simple fact of consciousness, viz: "I am." The point to be noticed is that philosophy is here preparing itself to start on an independent career, to build on the *data* of reason, and thus to ascertain what man can certainly know, apart from supernatural revelation. The human mind felt itself to be free, and attempted an independent flight. True the Church stood ready to pass judgment on its conclusions when these seemed to come in conflict with revelation. Cartesianism was for a time persecuted and put under the ban, but Protestantism had no Pope and no arm of civil power to crush out independent investigation, and the consequence was that philosophy went on in its free, independent course. In Germany especially, its career, through the investigations of Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, was such as to astonish the world. The advance in philosophic thought was as marvellous as it was in the progress of science. If since the Reformation a new world has been opened up for science, in the astounding discoveries and inventions that have been made, philosophy as well has opened up a new world for pure thought. Kant's searching Critique of the Pure Reason, as well as his Critique of the Practical Reason, and Judgment, was for metaphysics what the invention of printing was for the dissemination of knowledge. Kant has been for the modern world what Aristotle was for the ancient. All metaphysicians borrow from him. He did more, perhaps, than any one man to demolish the empirical system of Locke and all sensationalists. And so, in a merely scientific point of view, how much is philosophic science indebted to those masters in the world of thought, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel! The ablest philosophy of the present age is indebted to these great thinkers for the main substance of its system, even where they make it a special point to repudiate some of their errors, just as in Logic little, if anything, new has been added to Aristotle's Organon. Such immense progress in philosophic thought would never have been attained under the leading-strings of Mediæval scholasticism. It has been fashionable, we know, in certain quarters to decry what is called German transcendentalism, but when such thinkers as Alexander Hamilton take Kant as his master, its value is acknowledged even in English philosophy. We grant that these systems of German philosophy cannot be received as a whole by the Christian Church, but this does not forbid us to acknowledge the great work their authors have done for the progress of philosophic thought.

But philosophy and theology, reason and faith, cannot be separated. Hence we might expect, what occurred in fact, that though science and philosophy started in an independent career, yet they could not proceed without coming into contact with revelation and theology. This contact, and conflict, opened up the second stage in the history of Protestantism, if not of modern Christianity, in its relation to science and philosophy.

The philosophy of Descartes was first laid hold of by the Reformed theology. Cartesianism became incorporated in the teaching of the Federal school. It had its friends and its enemies among theologians, and it had its good points and its errors. In some respects it could be used to advantage by theology, but in others it ministered to heresy. The philosophy of Leibnitz, through Wolff who systematized and utilized it, came into still closer relation with the Church. Wolffian Supernaturalism for a time gained favor, and there seemed to be peace between theology and logic. But the philosophy of Wolff was unsound, and it was felt that it was damaging to the doctrines of the Church, at least it was found wanting for the purpose for which it was employed. A temporary reaction took place, reason began to grow bold, and now assumed a hostile attitude to Christianity. The strife between Supernaturalism and rationalism was inaugurated. A first stage of rationalism came to its bad fruit in the *Wolfenbüttel fragments*, and in the gross vulgarity of a Bahrdt.

We cannot go through the varying character of the strife during the period of rationalism. For the proper understanding of this history we must see in it good as well as evil. Faith cannot stand independent of reason, nor can reason get along without faith. The first natural creation, and the second supernatural creation, science and revelation, must harmonize, for they are from the same God. This gave strength to rationalism in its contest with the abstract Deistic supernaturalism with which it was opposed, and the result at last was that Christianity was forced to take higher and better ground for its defence. In this last, or present, phase of the question a far more deep and inward harmony has been realized between science and revelation than was the case in former times. Germany did not repudiate the investigations of philosophy, but used them in her theology. Any one who takes the pains to compare a modern work on Dogmatic Theology with one of earlier times will see at once the presence of philosophic thought in the former as it is not to be seen in the latter. Even those who reject, in theory, the idea of using philosophy in systematic theology, practically contradict their own theory. As the Greek language furnishes the outward material or form for the New Testament Scriptures, so philosophy furnishes the forms of thought in which theology gives expression to its dogmas. A theologian might as well attempt to repudiate the use of Logic in the construction of his theology, as to attempt to ignore philosophy.

The very definition of theology, as the science of God, or of religion, at once indicates the union of the natural and the supernatural. The data of revelation are supernatural, but the science, as the form in which the revelation is set forth for reason, is human, natural.

As an illustration of what we are here urging, take the question of Biblical interpretation as related to modern science. The opening chapters of Genesis are not interpreted now as they formerly were. Formerly the six days of creation were regarded as six natural days, at least the age of the earth was fixed, on the authority of the inspired record, as only six thousand years. The investigations of Geology showed that the earth must be much older. At first, Biblical interpreters resisted. The inspired word must be regarded as authoritative against all uninspired science. But it was plain that God's word written in Scripture and on the rocks must be in harmony. No one questions the authority of the inspired record, but the interpretation of that record is not inspired,—that perhaps may be amended. The result is, there is now an agreement acknowledged between Scripture and Science on this subject. Some of the very men who denounce modern philosophy, and profess to refuse it any function in constructing a theology, at the same time parade the agreement of the science of Geology with the proper interpretation of the opening chapters of Genesis. But philosophy is, to say the least, as worthy of regard as Geology.

The point we desire to make plain here is, that there is a more free and inward reconciliation between revelation and science acknowledged in the present than in any former age. This agreement is not indeed fully discerned or demonstrated. The two are still often arrayed against each other. Now and then a scientist, like Tyndal with his prayer-test, comes forward to proclaim a contradiction between science and faith, but the position taken now, more generally, by the best representatives on both sides is, that there can be no real contradiction, and when an apparent one presents itself both sides should labor to discover the real agreement.

These are some of the principles or methods according to which modern church history may be studied. We might present others, but these will suffice to show the importance of the subject.

Which of these shall the historian adopt? We reply, he should have regard to them all. One does not exclude another. Christianity, in its onward progress in the world, has a constitution of its own, and may be studied in relation to itself, but as constituting the deepest element in history, it is related organically to all forms of human life. If we are able to understand what Christianity, in its essential nature, is, and study the fundamental law of its life, we will be able to take a many-sided view of its history, without interfering with its historical unity. This broad comprehension of the subject is what the student of history needs.

We repeat, however, what we stated in the beginning of this article, that no full and satisfactory method of interpreting modern church history can be found until the present period comes to a close in some epoch. There are forces in history which seem to have been latent for ages, but which may become important factors in the coming age. The Greek Church, for instance, has been regarded as a sort of stagnant eddy, standing still while the course of history in other sections of the Church was moving on. But there are already indications that that Church may yet become an important element in Christian history. Changes may take place in the whole order of history which will reveal forces now at work of which we have been ignorant.

This fact, however, should not have the effect to weaken interest in the study of history from present data. But it should lead all to exercise humility and modesty in setting forth principles of interpreting the present movements of the Church. History opens up one of the grandest fields of study. Many master minds have traversed this field, but those who have studied history with most effect are the readiest to acknowledge that we know as yet but little about it. It contains the deep mystery of the world's life. Only in the light of its final conclusion will we be able to trace and read the meaning of its mysterious pathway. Faith now catches gleams of that light, and leads the way to only partial understanding of the past and present.

ART. VIII.—THE STARRY HEAVENS.

BY PROF. THEODORE APPEL, D. D.

THE heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork.

This is an exclamation drawn forth from a religious mind by the mere contemplation of the starry heavens, unaided by the revelations of modern science. The Psalmist was not an astronomer, and his knowledge of the stars, as compared with that which is widely diffused in our days, was very imperfect. Like all others in that remote age of the world, he had in fact a very inadequate idea of the size, number or distances of celestial bodies, and he therefore labored under many disadvantages in his conception of the grandeur and magnificence of the universe regarded as a whole. And yet, although his acquaintance with the facts in the case was extremely limited, his view of creation was both exalted and profound, much more so than that of many in our day who have all the helps of science at their command. He saw law, order, regularity and symmetry in the structure of the heavens and in their diversified phenomena: but more than this, he saw the hand of God everywhere in His works on high. He it was who had called them into being, marshalled them into numerous hosts, and so arranged them that they might in concert best declare His praise. Whilst the sweet singer could lay no claim to the technical knowledge of our age, he possessed that which was higher and better, reverence, homage and faith in God, qualities for which the old Hebrew prophets were pre-eminently distinguished, but in which these latter ages, so remarkable for their increase in knowledge, is sadly deficient. With less knowledge of secondary causes than what we possess, to him the fact of one first Great Cause everywhere stood out in prominent relief, especially in the visible heavens, where the attributes of His being were inscribed in characters of light. To him all creation was radiant with the effulgence of the divine glory; to him the sun, moon and stars, which move only in silent grandeur to most beholders, became as it were a living personality that broke forth spontaneously in accents of praise to Him who had created them.

The wisdom of the Psalmist is calculated to teach all alike, even the profoundest astronomer, a salutary lesson. We in fact should not only catch his spirit and be filled with his fervor in the contemplation of the starry worlds, but we should rise above him in our reverence and adoration, for the reason that our knowledge is so much greater. The immense progress of science in our days, and more particularly in the department of astronomy, lays us under a corresponding degree of responsibility, not only to study the handiworks of the Creator as a duty or to enjoy them as a luxury, but to seek in all such studies to promote our knowledge of God, and, in this, way to advance our true spiritual culture. If the physical heavens, when they were so imperfectly known, declared the glory of God and called forth the devout homage of the beholder, how much more so ought this be the case, when they are laid open to our view in all their grandeur and magnificence!

A brief survey of the heavens, as made from the elevated summit which we have reached in these latter days, will suffice in the case of ingenuous minds, at least, to show how much more resplendently the divine glory shines forth in the sphere of nature than it did in ancient times, when at best it shone only as a comparatively dim light in a dark place. In this respect there is an advance in the revelation which God has been pleased to make of Himself in His works, in happy correspondence with that which He has made in the bosom of His Church. With the aids and helps of science, our view of he range and magnitude of creation has been almost indefinitely extended. By means of the telescope, the human eye has been enlarged, as it were, more than seven hundred times, and the light it receives from distant objects multiplied at least two hundred and fifty thousand times. In this way a tolerably correct approximation to a true estimate of the number, size and distances of the heavenly bodies, and, as a consequence, of the extent of the entire universe has been obtained.

When we turn our eyes upwards to the skies at night we see what we regard as a great host of glittering stars; but under the most favorable circumstances, we cannot count more than two or three thousand of them with the naked eye. When, however, the telescope is directed towards the heavens, the number is at once increased apparently without any limit. Millions upon millions, which had from the beginning been concealed in the depths of space, loom up to view and claim our recognition. This is the case, no matter in which direction the instrument is turned; but it is more especially so, when it sweeps the Milky Way, that belt of faint light, which seems to flow across the heavens like a celestial river. This is made up of multitudinous stars, which, because they are seen at such immense distances, seem to be crowded one upon another like so many brilliant gems. Their blended light gives us that mild radiance in our evening skies, which poets have sometimes regarded as a faint reflection of the world of glory beyond the material universe. These hosts of stars, as numerous as the sand on the sea-shore or the leaves scattered by the autumnal winds, constitute, however, only one system of stars: it is only a single firmament, that which surrounds us on all sides, the parts of which seem to look down upon man as their centre. Thousands of other such firmaments are there, wherever we pierce the dark profound which seems to envelope our system of burning orbs on the outside. Away beyond the Galaxy small clouds, or cloudlets, no larger than the palm of the hand, have been discovered, and these nebulæ, as they are called, when seen through a powerful instrument, turn out to be clusters of stars, or rather, firmaments in fact, as grand, as beautiful and as large as our own. Thus creation is enlarged thousands upon thousands of times. But numerous as the hosts of worlds become, when our vision is aided by a good instrument, it is well known that after all we can see only a part of their vast number, only perhaps some of their more prominent divisions, whilst the larger portion will remain forever unseen by mortal eyes. Each star that glitters in our nocturnal skies is a sun, bright, glorious and effulgent as our own beautiful sun, and, no doubt, the centre of a solar system like our own, where planets revolve in prescribed orbits, carrying with them attendant satellites or moons; where comets come and go; and where swarming metors, the smallest of the heavenly bodies, flash across the evening sky, just as they do with us.

These stars, although they appear so small, as mere points of light, are immense bodies, most of them a million of times larger than our earth. To the Psalmist the earth was only a narrow stretch of land bounded by oceans all around. Now we know that it is a planet, very large indeed as compared with any single country; but large as it is, 25,000 miles in circumference, it is in reality, only a small body as compared with those innumerable orbs that look down upon us during the night from the heights above.

During the early ages of the world the heavenly bodies were regarded as being at no great distance from the earth. They were merely evening lamps, lighted up to give light to the inhabitants of the earth during the night. It was thought they were removed from us, at most, not more than a few hundred miles, and so they were regarded simply as appendages or parts of this world of ours. There could, therefore, be no adequate idea of the extent or magnitude of the universe as a whole. As in religion, so in the knowledge of nature, men lived in the mere twilight of science. In what might be called the new dispensation of knowledge, accordingly the progress is equally as great as in that of religion. Our own world, the earth, instead of being the universe or the main division of it, is only a small part of it, merely a drop in the great ocean of being. The sun is more than ninety millions of miles from us; but even this vast distance is a mere point as compared with the distances of the stars or the dimensions of the whole universe. The length and breadth of creation are not estimated by millions upon millions of miles, but by millions of millions of miles.

The faintest star visible through the telescope, which, however, does not even mark the frontier of the universe, is so remote from us that it requires many thousands of years before its faint light reaches our earth. The Milky Way, which seems to us a narrow belt or girdle in the heavens, is in fact many millions of millions of miles in thickness, whilst it extends out in length and breadth many hundred times its thickness. From a few facts like these we must see at once that the creation is so vast in its proportions, that its dimensions simply baffle us in every effort we make to form anything like an adequate conception of them. It cannot enter into the heart of man here in our present state to form any adequate idea of its vastness as a whole.

But the heavens do not merely present to our view immense and innumerable worlds, connected together only by magnificent distances. As such they bring us into communication simply with large masses of matter and physical distances. They constitute a system and are under the influence of law throughout. Order everywhere rules supreme. Each sphere has its place and moves along the path which has been prescribed to it. No where in this vast domain of creation do we see the least trace of disorder or confusion. The smallest meteor up to the largest sun that blazes in vasty space obeys the law imposed on it when it was created in the beginning. Planets revolve around their central suns, satellites around their primaries and fixed stars around some other centre hidden in the obscurity of space. All are in motion, none at rest; and yet complicated as this tremendous system of the universe is, no collisions or catastrophes are ever reported. We hear of the music of the spheres, but of no discords, crashes or jarring friction. Every member is bound to the whole by a law of obedience that knows of no exception. The single force of gravitation, combined with a primitive impulse, controls all their motions and preserves the order and the equilibrium of the whole.

It is, however, necessary to enter still farther into the penetralia of the cosmos, if we wish to estimate at its full value the impression, which it is calculated to make on an intelligent and reverential mind. It declares to us in its vast avenues and magnificent abodes the handiwork of God ; but from an inward prompting, we involuntarily inquire for its ultimate design. It is certainly not an empty show, nor is it merely a series of mere panoramic views, rising up one above the other until they fade away in a dark and empty profound. The ancients generally, and the Psalmist no doubt among them, regarded this world of ours, now known to be so small and limited in its proportions, as the end of creation, the centre around which the meaning of the whole revolved. To them the sun, moon and stars were made for man, and were only part and parcel of a system which realized its end in the aid which the constituent parts or members rendered to the human race. The earth then was the only really favored spot in this vast creation, and man with the animals beneath him were the only beings that received any felt benefit from that immense outlay of wisdom, power and goodness involved in the creation of these worlds. Such an apprehension as this necessarily followed from the limited knowledge which the ancients possessed in regard to the range of the Creator's works. But this is now all changed, and it turns out that the earth instead of being the chief and most important body in the universe is only one among innumerable others like it that fill up the immensity of space. The stars that are visible would be useful to man, because they shine down upon us at night, with a serene and benignant light, although we might dispense with them ; but of what use would those stars be to the earth that are so far removed as to be invisible to us even through the most powerful telescope ?

The inference therefore is irresistible that the heavens were not made simply for the world of mankind, but that they contain innumerable other worlds, which like our own, are also the abodes of intelligent and immortal beings like man. In support of this proposition it seems scarcely to be necessary to resort to the long and labored course of argumentation, which has been employed by the advocates of a plurality of worlds. The volumes and learned essays that have been written of late years to prove that there are more worlds than one do not materially strengthen the general conviction that the worlds above us are teeming with creatures like ourselves, radiant with the light of intelligence and warm with affection and love. Here intuition and the general reason carry with them a stronger demonstrative force than logical or intellectual processes, however ably conducted. Here the astronomer and theologian meet on common ground, shake hands and mutually congratulate each other on the accessions of new and inhabited territory, which has been added to our knowledge. The vast discoveries, that have been made in modern times in regard to the wide range of creation, seems in truth to leave no room for doubt that it is inhabited in every direction; and in the light simply of these discoveries, it has long ago come to be generally taken for granted, that as we have sister-planets, so also we have sister-spirits dwelling all around us in the far off depths of space, created in the image of God, endowed with the gift of immortality and intended eternally to show forth His praise. As vegetation is spread over the earth wherever it finds a congenial soil, so every celestial body, which is adapted to animal and human life, is no doubt filled with it to overflowing. Some of them may not be so adapted, just as there are parts of the earth's surface not adapted even to the lowest forms of vegetable life. Our moon is no doubt an arid waste, made up of extinct volcanoes and widely extended lava beds, where probably not indeed the lowest forms of life could struggle into existence, even if some favorable breeze should carry to those sterile regions the germs of vitality. Other satellites, all of which, however, are small and insignificant bodies relatively speaking, may be equally as barren as our own. The fixed stars, the centres and suns of planetary systems, the sources of light, heat, chemical and electrical influences and of motion to innumerable planetary worlds, may also, on account of the intense combustion which they are ordained to keep up during the countless ages, be disqualified for living beings of any kind. But then there are left numerous planets like our own, more numerous than the fixed stars, which may contain all the necessary conditions for a complete and perfect organization, commencing in the mineral and ending in races of beings equal or even superior to man. This no doubt is the grand mission of the planets. Physically they are subordinate and dependent on their physical centres; but intellectually considered, they are the highest and most important parts of creation. They are the homes of reason and the theatres upon which the grand march of history is carried forward. Creation, accordingly, commences in nebulous matter or chaos, then organizes itself into stars or fixed centres, and afterwards completes itself in the planetary worlds, which crown and beautify the whole process, like so many diadems of glory. These latter are mounts on the plane of existence, from which rational beings look beyond the sphere of nature and from which they at last ascend to the bright empyrean beyond, which is intended to be their final resting-place and home.

Such a hasty glance, as that which we have just given, is sufficient of itself to make the most profound impression upon the beholder and to call forth the most lively response, whereever the human heart retains anything of its native simplicity, or is not already debauched by bad training or a corrupt education. It is not at all necessary that it should be required to familiarize itself with all the details and intricacies of astronomical science, in order that it may receive the full benefit of the survey. Here again our intuitional powers are of more account than mathematics or demonstration. In fact, if we have no sense of the Divine presence in nature, our reasoning about secondary causes is just as likely to lead us away into darkness as into light. All that is necessary for us is to lift up our eyes and "consider the heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained (Ps. viii.)" in order that the hidden depths of the soul may be stirred so as to give forth the right response. Such a contemplation brings out at once the distinction between God and the creature in the mind of the beholder, and hence the Psalmist exclaims: What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him? O Lord, our God, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! We spontaneously ask, who made all these things? Conscience as well as reason answers that God alone is their Author. They did not exist from all eternity, neither did they come into being by chance. But if God is their Author, their grandeur and magnificence enables us to form some conception of His character and of what kind of a being He must needs be. Infinitely greater and more glorious must He be than His works. So great, that resplendently as His majesty shines forth in the magnitude of His works, yet must He in a great measure remain concealed from our view. Necessarily must such a being, so far as we are concerned, dwell in darkness and thick clouds. But here in the magnificence of His works, which bear some proportion to the greatness of His being, He unveils something of the majesty of His glory. Here through His handiwork flows forth something of the effulgence of His presence like a stream of light over all these worlds; that is, the outer rays of His glory, the full brilliancy of which must be tempered by the outward vail of nature, because man at first is not qualified to see God as He is. Hence the Psalmist exclaims, The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge.

The mere outward contemplation of the cosmos furnishes us simply with illustrations of the eternity, immensity and infinite power of God. But in proportion as we consider its internal organization, we are confronted with something more spiritual and ethereal in its character than mere ponderous masses of matter, and we are brought into the presence of the majesty of law on the most sublime scale. All law, however, implies a lawgiver, and the power which all law carries with it is due to a supreme will, which is back of it and the perennial source of its supply. The heavens thus considered constitute a system of forces or laws, an intellectual or rational creation, a kingdom or domain, which can be held together only by an intelligent head. The laws in themselves would be empty words, unless enforced by Almighty power. They are in fact only so many outward expressions of the Supreme Will, that keeps up and maintains all the life and activity of the universe.

Here the character of God appears under a still higher aspect. When the heavens are viewed simply as composed of innumerable ponderous spheres, the glory of God appears in that omnipotence of power by which they were formed in the beginning and by which they are still upheld. But regarded as a system of laws, they illustrate not only His great power, but also His wisdom and His intelligence. This brings Him before us in the light of a rational and intelligent Being, as the Architect of creation and the intelligent Ruler over all these vast domains. The supposition that nature is the product of some dark mysterious force that resides in it and works by a blind necessity or fate, finds no support in reason or analogy, and is abhorrent to the general sense of mankind. Unbelief is one of the vices of civilization and the result of a vicious speculation; faith in the Divine is one of our original and most precious endowments. Wisdom and design, so far as consciousness as well as experience go, are always connected with a rational agent, a personal being, as their author and source. So when men cast their eyes upwards and observe everywhere in the heavens traces of order, wisdom and design, they cannot divest themselves of the conviction that they see the footsteps of a great, a glorious and intelligent Being, who, though He hides Himself from mortal vision, leaves everywhere on His works the reflection of His hidden majesty and glory. It is only when men's native sense for the Divine is debauched by false refinement or a corrupt civilization that they do not see these things and say there is no God. Hence wild tribes, uncivilized peoples, whose original moral constitutions have not been debilitated by the influence of a false artificial life, often present a keen sense for the supernatural, a deep reverence which runs out into superstition. Fools, it is said, that is, persons who are destitute of those endowments that distinguish man from the brute creation, say in their hearts, there is no God.

The outward universe considered as a system or as the most perfect piece of mechanism, is, however, at best, only the house or external shell of creation. It was made, as we have seen, to be the temporary home of intelligent beings where they may be cherished, educated and finally prepared for a higher plane of existence. Here they abide for a time, vegetable-like, fixed to some planetary soil, but only that they may in the end be fully emancipated, and then, on expanded wing, rise above these perishable worlds and soar away to their eternal home in the spirit land.

The creation of these worlds of intelligent beings, throws still further light on the character of God and presents it to us under a singularly interesting and captivating aspect. Elsewhere we witness His Almighty and everywhere present power, wisdom and intelligence; but here we have an opportunity to behold the display of His goodness and love in His relations with intelligent beings. In the material worlds, we see dimly the presence of a personal being, and an unconscious impulse compels us to ascribe to Him the government and control of all things; but it is only as we look at ourselves or beings like ourselves, that we are assured of the personal existence of God. Outward nature reveals to us rather what God does, but man, formed in the image of God, reveals to us what God is. He was intended from the beginning, or rather from all eternity, to be the mirror that was to reflect, not the separate perfections of the Divine character, but to unite them, all in their proper order and place in one divine, supernatural personality. Hence when this mirror had become darkened, blurred and broken, a new and perfect man had to be create din order that the earthly might reflect the image of the heavenly. Nature could not do this.

Thus the government of God is indefinitely enlarged when the heavenly bodies are peopled with rational and intelligent beings. It also assumes a much higher and more refined character, when it is exercised over spiritual beings which are allied to Himself in nature, all of which brings into still stronger relief His declaratory glory. How far His empire extends over such beings we do not know. As we cannot count the number of worlds projected into space, much less can we form any adequate conception of the number of their inhabitants. Our own population is estimated as over one thousand millions of souls. Now if we suppose that there is only one inhabited world as populous as our own for each individual inhabitant on our globe, and so multiply one thousand millions by itself, we will have arrived only at an approximation to the sum total of the subjects of that vast kingdom upon whom God has bestowed the gift of immortality and upon whom He is daily and hourly bestowing His gifts. Over all these also, as well as over the vast machinery of the celestial worlds, He rules and reigns. Minds as well as stars make up His dominions. They constitute His real subjects, and all look up to Him as their head, from whom they derive their vitality. He is the centre of these wide realms, around Whom ranged in distant spheres all these spiritual beings reflect back the glory of their great Original. Now they dwell in distant and separate homes that admit of no present communication. But they will not remain forever in such a state of isolation. We know that when the last reveille of creation is sounded, they will all gather around the throne of glory, an exceedingly great multitude, whom no man can number. From this point of view how exceedingly expressive is the language of the old Hebrew poet, when he speaks of Jehovah, as the Lord of Hosts. Thus the stars bring us not only within the gorgeous antechamber of the Great King, but into relation with the innumerable throng of His subjects in all parts of His dominions, with whom we shall doubtless communicate directly hereafter and with whom we shall spend an eternity together.

Thus far we have spoken of the material universe as the abode of intelligent and immortal beings. But it is manifestly more than this; it has a much higher and more spiritual character in itself considered than a mere physical abode for man. His wants, or at least his more immediate wants could be satisfied with a much smaller outlay of wealth and power. The universe everywhere shows indications of something more spiritual and refined than the mere utilitarian character which is usually assigned to it. As a palace is more than a home for royalty, and goes beyond certain useful purposes, so the universe in a still higher degree looks beyond the mere useful and rises up palpably into the region of pure and beautiful thoughts. It may therefore be compared to a work of art; it is in fact a work of art, on the most sublime scale, in which within the limits of time and space, divine thoughts and acts are expressed and realized under appropriate forms and symbols. It is as a whole a sacrament of the divine presence. Like a parable its meaning goes beyond the direct sense of its own words and points away from its own physical constitution in the bosom of nature to a higher and more spiritual creation which lies above it. As a symbol, full of light and expression, it presents God to us under the aspect of an Artist, Who formed the original conception of the universe and then so happily realized it in time and space. Here He appears, not only as wise, infinitely powerful and good, but also as infinitely beautiful, as one that is altogether lovely. Thus He is not only the ruler and governor of all the heavenly hosts, but their chief ornament, the source and fountain of all their beauty. God is said to be love; so also may it be said of Him, that He is beauty itself.

In rude and barbarous ages the typical sense of the cosmos does not come out prominently. It implies culture and refinement, a refined sense which does not exist generally among rude people, who are carried away with feelings of wonder and awe, rather than of admiration and love of nature. Poets and artists usually are the first to catch the inspiration and to invest the natural world with spiritual meaning: and the beautiful lines of Addison are not a mere figure of speech, when he speaks of the stars as

> Forever singing as they shine,
> The hand that made us is divine.

But all true culture leads to the same spiritual interpretation of nature. This indeed we may say is one of the sublime virtues of civilization, just as skepticism is one of its worst diseases. Where all is right and the eye single, nature on the one hand is not divine, nor on the other a mere shadow, but a holy emblem of the divine presence and a faint reflection of a higher world of glory projected here on the fields of space and time.

In such close connection does the material world stand related to that higher spiritual economy which lies above it. And such we maintain is the legitimate impression which it is calculated to make on the mind of the beholder. To all this, however, it may be said, that observation, especially in our days, does not seem to confirm any such supposed revelation of the divine in the bosom of the natural order. It is certain that astronomers are not all devout, and some of them, it is known, not only see nothing divine in nature, but deny its existence there at least altogether. With many scientific men, the spiritual side of nature is entirely ignored or pushed aside, as an intrusion, with something of an illy disguised disgust. They either know of nothing beyond the laws of the natural world, which are then self-sufficient, or else, if it be admitted that there is something back of these laws, to account for the activity in the world which they everywhere witness, it is made to be nothing more than some dark fate or necessity, conveniently called the unknowable. Thus darkness, doubt and in fact, atheism itself; have sprung up amidst the full light of our boasted civilization, at a time too, when science has made its greatest achievements, and in such countries as Germany, England and France, where, it might be supposed, all the intellectual light of previous ages has been concentrated as it were in a single focus. The fact that this tendency towards materialism has exhibited itself in such circumstances, and in some of the best minds in these countries, is calculated, we admit to produce the impression, that the world of the past was in error in its great reverence for God in His works, and that all this with numerous other superstitions has been swept away by the progress of science.

But we reply at once that in a case like this, the deductions of a few undevout astronomers and skeptical scientists have small weight by the side of the almost universal sentiment of mankind in all ages and in all countries, all of whom in one way or another point to nature and affirm the existence of God. It is in fact a question that cannot be settled by the speculative reason or the logical understanding. Unless an individual is overpowered by a sense of God in his own consciousness, no kind of reasoning or demonstration is ever likely to convince him even of His existence, much less of His glory as displayed in the outward world. The idea of God is involved in our very constitution, and exists there previous to all attempts to demonstrate His existence. We have a consciousness of Him, just as we have a distinct consciousness of nature and of ourselves. This shows itself throughout all history. Men everywhere pray, offer sacrifices or employ means to propitiate the favor of the Deity. This is something natural and spontaneous, and not properly the result of thinking or reasoning. As men have a moral sense, which guides them in distinguishing right from wrong, so they have a sense for the divine, a *sensus numinis*, which brings them into communication at once with the supernatural and divine wherever they are displayed, whether in nature or in the kingdom of grace. Some would call it an instinct, and some an intuition. It has the character of a distinct sense or feeling. It may with propriety be denominated faith, a natural faith which all persons, whether Christians or heathen, may and do exercise. As such it is an original and most valuable endowment in man, without which the unity of his being would in fact be destroyed. It is his inner light, which still guides him, when he strays away from the true light of the world. It is the capacity, with which he sees the glory of God in the firmaments above, and, which when strengthened and enlarged enables him to see His full orbed splendor in the person of His only begotten Son, our Lord.

It is therefore simply gratuitous when scientific men attempt to settle all questions pertaining to God and the spiritual world by bringing them down within the sphere of the mere understanding. It was never intended that we should attain to a knowledge of God in that way. It is just as likely that He will be ruled out as acknowledged before such a tribunal. So it is with other questions of supreme importance to our race. Men do not commence to reason in this way on the great questions of virtue and vice. They do not go through a course of demonstrative reasoning to show that murder or arson is wrong. All alike have a keen sense within which enables them to decide what the true character of such crimes islo ng before the reasoning powers are exercised in regard to them. So they do not institute a course of reasoning to show that moral purity is right and proper. What would we think of the man for instance, who would raise the question, whether chastity is a virtue or a prejudice? All such questions as relate to the beautiful and the good, at least, are settled by a special sense or inner light which is active whether the mere intellect approve, or not. Reasoning, or all sorts of ratiocination, are useful and fruitful only as they act in harmony with these higher endowments of our moral nature. And we claim, accordingly, that there is a similar tribunal for all questions pertaining to God and the eternal world, removed far above what the Scriptures call, the "carnal understanding." As we have a sense for the true, the beautiful and the good, so we have a sense for the divine, which God addresses both in nature and in revelation, and which, when at all true to itself, acknowledges Him and confesses that He is what He is. All history confirms this; but apart from the general experience of nations in all grades of culture, it is abundantly supported by analogy. It will be acknowledged by all, except extreme skeptics, that we have a consciousness of the world as an existence outside and independent of us. But how does it come that we know this? We communicate with it through our senses; these, however, are internal, subjective; and some have maintained that we have no certain knowledge of an external world whatever, and that all our knowledge consists merely of certain, internal and subjective impressions. Only a few rash persons have had the boldness to entertain such a monstrous proposition. The difficulty has been solved, by maintaining very properly that, in addition to the power of receiving impressions of the outward world through our sensations, we have also the power of perceiving the actual existence of those objects in the outer world which producethese impressions. But if through our sensations, we are enabled to perceive the existence of objects outside of us in time and space, why may we not also have the power of perceiving through the outward world, the existence of a spiritual world beyond the region of time and space?

Now if this be so, it follows that the unbelief of scientific men in our day has little or no foundation in fact. The fault lies altogether in themselves, if they see no God in nature, no handiwork of His, no glory streaming forth from His government, no moral government, and no real answer to prayer. They have either had a bad education, which has stifled the sense of the divine in their nature or else they have choked it in their zeal for searching out secondary causes. In any case they are abnormal in their experience and, as specimens of humanity, border on the monstrous, for they have unnaturally and violently rooted up or denied one of the most fundamental sentiments of our common human nature.

Our time will not permit us to pursue this line of thought throughout all its details, interesting and captivating as that might be. We would add that it is a matter of great importance. In our days assaults are made not only upon Divine revelation, Christ and His Church; but also upon those fundamental sentiments of our human nature, upon which, as an external basis, all religion, natural and supernatural, rests. The attack is made upon a most vital point, upon our most vital stamina. If these once give way, all is lost. So it is in the case of our physical constitutions. If our bodies are broken down by vice or abuse, the mind and the spirit both suffer with them and the upward flights of the spirit are prevented. Ye believe in God, says Christ, believe also in Me. Here we are taught that faith in God ought to lead to faith in Christ as its complement. But in order that this process may be a free and natural one, it is all important that faith in God in the first place should be free and spontaneous. It is, therefore, important that natural reverence and faith in God should not only be insisted on in all culture, but that it should be fostered and encouraged; and to secure this result, we believe, much may be accomplished by the right study and contemplation of the starry heavens.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW. By John Peter Lange, D. D., Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn. Translated by Philip Schaff, D. D. Twelfth Edition Revised. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1873.

This is called "The Sunday-school Edition" of this popular Commentary. It is a volume of smaller size than the original issue, but contains all that is in the larger edition except the General Introduction. The Commentary proper is exactly the same. The smaller size of the volume is owing to the smaller marginal space which the pages contain. In the present form it is a much more convenient volume for use. We have no doubt this feature will render it more attractive for a large class of readers. The work will no doubt undergo still further condensation at some future time, leaving out perhaps much that is valuable only for the critical scholar.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW. Explained by Joseph Addison Alexander. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1873.

Another "Sunday-school Edition" of a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel. It is the last work on which the pen of Dr. Alexander was engaged. The work was interrupted by the death of the author. It is complete to the Seventeenth Chapter. The remaining chapters have merely the analysis given. The name of Dr. Alexander is a sufficient guarantee to the ability of this commentary.

A COMMENTARY CRITICAL, EXPOSITORY AND PRACTICAL, ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW, for use of Bible Classes and Sabbath-schools. By John J. Owen, D. D., LL. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1873.

Still another assistant for Sunday-school teachers and Bible Classes in the study of the New Testament It is published in very fine style, and will no doubt be sought after by the class of persons for whom it is especially designed.

INDEX OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Charles Hodge, D. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Company. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson and Sons. 1873.

Those who purchase Dr. Hodge's Theology will welcome this Index. It is a handsome volume of 81 pages.

NOTE—Several Book Notices not inserted in this number for want of room.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1873.

ART. I.—CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITY.*

BY PRESIDENT J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D.D. LL.D.

As the subject is altogether too broad for anything like full particular discussion, all that I can aim at in the present paper must be an outline simply of its general significance, in the form of a series of brief and comprehensive topics or heads of thought following one another in close logical order, and yet thrown each one more or less upon itself for its own separate evidence and confirmation.

I. The world of nature, made up as it is of innumerable parts, is nevertheless one universal whole, bound and held together through all its parts by the presence of a single Divine idea, which reaches its end in Man. Its constitution in this view is not mechanical, but organic; that is, it is not a scheme of things put together by simply external juxtaposition, but a system of things cohering together inwardly through the power of a common life. It may be regarded as a pyramid, rising through a scale of degrees to its apex; or as an orb, determined from all sides to its centre. In either case the end is the same. Man is the apex and centre, and for this reason also in himself separately considered an epitome, a synopsis or recapitulation we may say, of the entire natural creation. He is the last sense of it, and the only true key to its meaning in all its lower forms of existence. So much we are plainly taught by the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. Our own consciousness confirms the lesson; and it has come to be so irradiated now by the light of science, that a man must forfeit all claim to rationality to make it a matter of any serious question or doubt.

---

* A paper prepared, by invitation, for the General Conference of the EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

II. It is no less plain, however, that man is the consummation of nature in this way, only because he is in himself a great deal more than nature. Nature in its totality looks beyond itself, is a continual nisus indeed in its own constitution toward a higher order of existence without which it has no power ever to become complete; and the very fact that it ends in man implies therefore of itself that he is for it at the same time the beginning of that higher existence, and the medium accordingly through which room is made for the work of creation to run its course in new and far more glorious form. Such superiority belongs to him, as we know, in virtue of what he is as mind or spirit, in which are joined together as one the two faculties of the will and the understanding, making him to be in the image and likeness of God, and capable thus of receiving into himself the light of God's truth and the power of God's love as the perfection of his own life. Man in this way exists really in two worlds. In his physical organism he belongs at all points to the world of nature, the system of things seen and temporal, with which he stands in continual communication through his bodily senses. In his spiritual organism he is just as intimately comprehended in the world of spirit, the system of things unseen and eternal, which lies wholly beyond the range of his senses, although it is all the time touching him in fact and making itself felt upon his life in a different way. The difference between these two orders of existence with man, however, is not just that between body and spirit generally considered; for the distinguishing life of man, that by which he differs from the mere animal, is primarily and essentially all in his mind, and only by derivation from thence in his body. But his mind itself is so constituted as to have in it so to speak two different regions, one looking directly into the natural world through the body and the other opening principally into the spiritual world. Hence properly speaking the difference between the external man and the internal man, some sense of which is found entering into the deeper thought of the world through all ages. It is not simply with the regenerate and righteous that such dualism has place; it belongs to our life here universally.* Man is by his creation at once both spiritual and natural, the denizen of two worlds. That is his distinction from the beast, which is natural only and not spiritual.

III. The dualism here brought into view, it is hardly necessary to say, is not abstract, the conjunction of these two modes of existence in any simply outward relation. It is a distinction which seeks and demands unity, the organization of its two sides into the power of a single concrete life. Neither is there any room for doubt, in regard to the law which should govern the coalescence of the two orders of existence into one. The natural, all know at once, is in order to the spiritual. Here only it is that mind comes to its native home and true destination, by entering into the light of God. The two orders of life are thus of themselves correlated as outward and inward, lower and higher; and this implies of course, that the outward and lower should be ruled in full by the inward and higher. That is the true idea of human culture. That is the only intelligible end of man's redemption. It is possible for this order to be reversed. The spiritual may be hopelessly turned away from the light of heaven, and merged in the darkness of mere nature. But that in the end is the damnation of hell.

---

* "Das Gesammtverhalten wie das Gesammtgefühl des Menschen bekundet auf unwiderstehliche Art, dass er als '*Fremdling*' sich wisse in dieser Sinnenwelt und dass das Hinausstreben über dieselbe der eigentliche Sinn *aller* eigenthümlich menschlichen Thätigkeit sei. Daher die rastlose Unruhe und der tiefe Zwiespalt, der sein ganzes Wesen durchzieht, indem er jedes Erreichte sofort wieder vor sich verneinen muss; die ungestillte Sehnsucht gerade mitten im kräftigsten Lebensgefühle, die jeder höchsten Freude sogleich sich beimischende ernste Wehmuth, was ebenso die Quelle höchster Erhebung zu Poesie und Religion dem Menschen wird, als umgekehrt den irdisch Gesinnten in die Verödung eines leeren, ewig unbefriedigten Strebens hinauswirft: alles dies is nur dass Zeugniss einer unablässigen *Verneinung* seines gegenwärtigen Zustandes; das heisst aber zugleich: seines substantiellen *Hinausseins* über denselben. Es ist zugleich die thatkräftige Wirkung und unwillkührliche Beglaubigung seines wahrhaftigen, jenseitigen Wesens. Indem der Mensch alles Zeitliche zu einem Ungenügendem herabsetzt, in keinem irdisch erreichten Ziele sich gefangen giebt, verräth er dadurch, eine überzeitliche Macht und eine überzeitliche Bestimmung in sich zu tragen." *From I. H. Fichte's Psychologie.*

IV. It is not then by any violent sundering of the higher life in man from the lower that he is redeemed and saved. This would be a sublimation of his existence that must destroy at last all its reality. What the case calls for is the full and complete reduction of his lower life to the obedience and service of the higher, the raising of the natural through the spiritual into the harmonious union of the whole man with God. Room is made for this in the twofold constitution of the mind itself, by which it is possible for it to flow down as it were from its own superior region into that which is lower, so as to join them together as with the intimacy of soul and body in the power of one and the same truly spiritual life. It is not simply from itself, however, that any such heavenward determination of the human spirit can come. There must be for this purpose a flowing into it of spirit and life from a yet higher sphere. Only in and by the powers of the heavenly world itself, only through real conjunction with these powers proceeding forth as they do from the Lord of life and glory, is it possible to conceive rationally of the glorification of the natural in man by means of his spiritual in the way here spoken of. The case requires and involves thus in the end an actual coming together of nature and the supernatural, the human and the divine, to make the idea of humanity and the world complete. On this hinges in truth the whole problem of man's salvation.

V. The twofold constitution of man, as we have now had it under consideration, may be taken as a key for the right appreciation in general of the two economies, the two different orders of existence, which are joined into one immediately by means of it in his person. We need no other argument to prove that the two economies are in fact one economy in a deeper and broader view, and that the unity of creation regarded as a whole does not stop by any means with the natural world, but embraces along with this at the same time the entire sense and significance also of the spiritual world. How indeed can we have any faith in creation at all as the work of Infinite Intelligence and Love under any other view? The two worlds, natural and spiritual, form together one universe; and the union of nature and mind in man serves to show, with a sort of palpable demonstration, how they stand related each to the other in this cosmical whole. Their connection is not one of space or time. It transcends altogether these limitations. The spiritual world is not on the outside of the natural locally, nor does it come after this temporally. It is not a mere sublimation or etherealization in any way of the natural. The relation between the two orders of existence is of one sort rather with that between soul and body in man; two modes of being, which are totally distinct, while yet they work into each other everywhere as coexistent spheres in the general identity of his life. It is the relation of interior and exterior, higher and lower, prior and posterior, cause and effect; and here, as in the case of soul and body, it is the spiritual world of course, which goes before the natural in this order of precedence. Things seen and temporal stand everywhere, thus, in the active presence and power of things unseen and eternal. The spiritual world, it has been well said, works from within, and actuates all and each of the things that exist and are formed in the world of nature, as the human mind works into the senses and motions of the body; so that all the particular things of nature are as it were sheaths and coverings, which encompass spiritual things, and proximately produce effects corresponding to the end of God the Creator.

VI. The spiritual world here introduced to our view, we can see at once, is heaven-wide apart from that abstract and visionary conception of it, by which it is too commonly regarded as being the mere negation or coming to an end of the world of outward sense and matter. We do not characterize it properly, when we speak of it simply as immaterial and supersensible, or resolve it into the notion of an intellectual and ideal system. It is beyond the reach indeed of our present sense, and for this reason it transcends also the range of all our natural thinking.

But this does not make it in any sense shadowy or unreal. In its own superior order of existence, it has a character of positive reality and substance which goes immeasurably beyond the visible and tangible show of things in the world of nature. The spiritual world is not the pale shadow of the natural. On the contrary, it is the cause of the natural, that on which it depends; the interior soul of the natural, that from which it draws its continual life; the universal issue and end of the natural, that in which only all its powers and possibilities become complete. It is a world or universe, full of concrete existence and sensible experience, full of living relations, activities and powers, full of endlessly diversified phenomenal scenery and surroundings, with which, for grandeur, beauty and glory, the universe of nature can bear no comparison whatever.

VII. The living entities, powers and activities of the spiritual world, thus gloriously constituted, refer themselves throughout to God as their origin and source, and in doing so form necessarily an organized system, endlessly manifold and yet universally one, flowing forth with perpetual derivation every where from the fulness of Him who in such way filleth all in all.

VIII. Collectively considered, this outflowing of the Divine Life, in the presence and power of which the spiritual world is thus created and upheld, is the *Word of God;* the self-utterance of the Infinite and Eternal Father, by which He is to be regarded as coming forth from the otherwise incomprehensible depths of His own absolute being, and making Himself known in the universe of His works. "By the Word of the Lord," we are told, "were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of His mouth." So again: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." What can be more plain or full than this? The whole creation has its principle and beginning here, starting in the spiritual world, and reaching down through that to the natural world, which as we have seen is dependent on the spiritual throughout as a lower and relatively more outward mode of existence. The Word of God is the alpha and omega of the universe, embracing angels and men, the heavens and all the powers therein, together with the whole boundless compass of nature; all things from first to last, from inmost to outmost, come together in this common ground, and have in them no real cause or power of existence in any other view.

IX. If any thing were needed more than has been already said to establish the idea of an organized harmonious unity, reaching through the universal creation and binding all its parts together as a single whole, we have it with overwhelming force in the great truth here brought into view. The Divine Word is the all in all of creation, the one principle from which the whole of it flows. How then must this not be, through all its orders of existence, through all its economies and constitutions whether of nature or of grace, one always and everywhere with itself, even as the Word is One?

X. The law of original existence for the world in this view, is of course no less necessarily the law also of its continued subsistence. Heaven and earth stand perpetually in the presence and power of the Divine Word; and this not in the character of an almighty *fiat* simply, taking effect upon them in an outwardly mechanical or magical manner, but in the way of life flowing into them continually through the Word from God Himself; in whom as we know, all angels and men, as well as all living creatures lower than man, live, move, and have their being. "Forever, O Lord, Thy Word is settled in heaven; Thou hast established the earth and it abideth." The principle of stability in both cases, is that from which both heaven and earth took their origin in the beginning. So all changes also, through what are called the laws of nature, come no otherwise in truth than by the operation of this Divine agency flowing down into the natural world through the spiritual. Nothing less than this is involved in that magnificent language of the Psalmist: "He sendeth forth His commandment upon earth; His word runneth very swiftly. He giveth snow like wool; He scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes. He casteth forth His ice like morsels; who can stand before His cold? He sendeth out His Word, and melteth them; He causeth His wind to blow, and the waters flow."

XI. The Divine Word, by which the heavens and the earth continually exist in the way now shown, is the same that constitutes the living soul of all Divine Revelation from the beginning; making the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in which this Revelation is contained, to be the very embodiment in natural form of a supernatural spiritual power and glory surpassing immeasurably the reach of all merely natural intelligence or thought. This is what we are to understand by the inspiration of the Bible. It is the Word of God, in its everliving supernal majesty, occupying and possessing the sacred text, not simply as the cause and origin of it at the first, but as its truly informing and actuating spirit through all time. Of the Bible it must be said always in this view, *God is There.* It is the very shekinah of His presence, as represented by the Ark containing the two tables of the Law in the Jewish sanctuary; the *testimony*, the *covenant*, so called, in and by which God came near to man and drew man into union with Himself. Everywhere the Bible is this union and meeting together of the invisible and eternal, the "powers of the world to come," with the interior deepest needs and aspirations of the human spirit in its present bodily state. Hence its authority for all orders and degrees of intelligence, from lisping infancy on to old age; an authority not dependent at all on criticism or hermeneutics, but powerful enough if need be to set this at defiance, to turn it into derision, as in itself a higher right, holding consciously—or if not that, then nevertheless *sensibly*—from the felt power of the Divine itself, hidden in the outward text, and yet shining forth from it so as to give understanding to the simple; even as one may take in the light of intelligence from the eye of another, and catch the inspiration of love from his beaming face, whose presence otherwise may be only most imperfectly understood. The full sense of the Holy Scriptures is unfathomable even for the angels themselves. How much less may it be sounded by the plummet of any simply human science? It is a voice everywhere from behind the veil of sense and time, having in it eternal meaning. What Christ says of His own speech on one occasion is true of Sacred Scripture universally; its words are SPIRIT and LIFE. They are "quick and powerful." God is in them of a truth.

XII. The economy of Revelation ends in what St. Paul calls the "Mystery of Godliness," by which God, as the Word, "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man." We cannot go too far in owning and proclaiming the infinite majesty of our Lord Jesus Christ, as being in this way the actual manifestation of God in the flesh. The whole truth, and power, and glory of the Gospel, are comprehended in St. Peter's confession, *Thou art the Son of God.* On this rock only, Christianity and the Church stand firm against the powers of hell. The Son of the living God, Christ is Himself the living God; the fulness of the Godhead bodily; the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person; the Lord of heaven and earth; by whom all things were created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; who is before all things, and by whom all things consist. He is the image of the otherwise invisible, unknowable, unapproachable God, whom no man hath seen nor can see. The Father is in Him, as He also is in the Father. He and the Father are one. He is in a word the Jehovah, the *I am*, of the Old Testament; the Alpha and Omega, as He proclaimed Himself in the vision of Patmos, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

XIII. Christ, the Son of God, is the Saviour of the world, through the Divine Life which is in Him as God, and which He is able to communicate derivatively to all who look to Him, and come to Him, for that purpose. Whatever other things enter into the idea of salvation, they are to be regarded as conditional only and incidental to this, which is most plainly set forth in the Gospel as central and fundamental for all else. "In Him was Life," it is said, "and the Life was the light of men." He is "the way, the truth, the Life." He is "the resurrection and the Life." To follow Him, is to "have the light of Life." He "hath Life in Himself," and in virtue of this "quickeneth whom He will." To His disciples He says, "Because I live, ye shall live also;" making life for them to be the efflux of His own Life. "God hath given to us eternal life"—so the Divine record itself runs—"and this *Life is in His Son.* He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life;" to which St. John adds with grand conclusion: "We know that the Son of God is come; and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and ETERNAL LIFE."

XIV. The Life which is thus in Christ the principle and fountain of salvation for men, must pass over to them in a living way, so as to become in them also a true rational and spiritual life conjoining them with the Life of the Lord; and the organ or faculty by which this is found to be possible on the side of man is *Faith;* which is an activity both of the understanding and the will in their highest form, joining them together as one in the apprehension of the Divine Truth and the Divine Good—these by their everlasting marriage constituting in fact the inmost essence and substance of the Divine Life. Faith is no mechanical or magical appointment in this view, through which men are justified and saved in an outward way by having imputed to them what is in truth no part of their own proper personal existence or experience. It is the meeting of the human spirit inwardly with the enlivening rays that issue actually from the Sun of Righteousness. It is the turning of the soul within itself toward the Lord, and the opening of its inmost receptivity to the life that is forever flowing from His presence.

XV. There is, in such view, only one true faith for man. All the innumerable realities of the spiritual world are so many truths, indeed, which make room for its exercise; but this universe of truths is at the same time one universal complex, in which all refer themselves with inward interdependence, correlation, and common derivation, to the same general origin and source; and so in full conformity with this, all the possible exercises of genuine faith refer themselves in like manner to a single generality, head themselves together as it were, explicitly or implicitly, in one ground faith which is the root and principle of faith in all other forms. What that primordial faith is —the faith of all faiths—is determined at once by what we are bound to acknowledge as the primordial truth—the truth of all truths—as this comes before us in the being of God, made known to us through His Word, and with full revelation at last only in and by His Son Jesus Christ. The true Christian faith in this view is not made up certainly of a system of separate and independent doctrines or facts, loosely thrown together each on its own supposed evidence and worth; neither can it be made to start from any such particular doctrine or fact at our pleasure. There is but one order here that is either practically or theologically sound and right; and that is the order which is governed by the objective constitution of the Gospel itself, the order which begins with the Lord God our Redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christ, and which sees and owns all other truth only as flowing from His presence.

XVI. It is strange indeed that any one looking earnestly into the New Testament should ever miss seeing, that the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ in the view now stated, the power of owning Him to be the Son of God (with all which that means), not notionally, and from the memory only, but from the interior depths of the soul, is in very truth the beginning of all faith, and that without which all else calling itself faith is turned into a pale abstraction resembling death far more than life. Can Peter's confession, the rock on which the Church is built, ever cease to be what it was in the beginning? Is it less true now than it was eighteen centuries ago, that the one universal work of God, the fountain of all other obedience and righteousness, is to *believe* on Him whom God hath sent? How often are we not told that to believe in Christ as the Son of God is of itself to have eternal life, and that the want of such faith in Him is itself the doom of death, because it is a rejection in fact of the life that dwells in His person and is to be found nowhere else? "He that heareth my word, He says, and *believeth on Him that sent Me* (in other words, seeth the Father in the Son), hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." But why go on here with testimonies? On this subject, they are altogether too full for particular quotation.

XVII. Life, eternal life, thus attributed to faith, is not to be viewed as a reward attached to it extrinsically by God, but is the necessary result of what faith is in its own nature and office; as being the medium of communication on the part of man with the Lord of life and glory, who is the fountain of all spiritual being, from which depends, as we have already seen, the right order and perfection also of all natural being. Faith saves us through its object, which is the Divine Truth, being in reality so related to this that neither can be in any man without the other. The Divine Truth (joined always with the Divine Love) is made through faith to be actually in the soul as a part of its own existence, like light in the eye. In Thy light, says the Psalmist, we shall see light. But light again is at once but another term for life; and in the spiritual world, accordingly, the Divine Truth is synonymous with the Divine Life; they cannot be sundered one from the other. In the heavens, truth is substantial essence just as really as life is, both flowing together from the Lord. "I am the Truth," he says; "I am the Light of the world;" "I am the Life;" all in the same intensely realistic sense. Faith, then, as the receptacle of Divine truth, the shining of Divine light in the soul, is necessarily communication at the same time with the Divine Life proceeding from Christ. Its power to save is just this, that it opens the spirit of man, made in the image of God, toward the answerable fulness of God in Christ, and so makes room for a veritable conjunction with Him, in the sense that the very idea of religion has been felt to demand through all ages. This, indeed, is Eternal Life.

XVIII. Christianity, having for its origin and ground our Lord Jesus Christ seen and owned by faith to be the Son of God, in the way now presented, is a vast and mighty system, as already intimated, of other truths and facts innumerable (taking in at last, indeed, the universal sense of the world), in which, however, all other truths are true, and capable of being truly believed, only in virtue of their inward coherence with what is here the beginning of all Christian life and doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, for example, is for our faith and theology, only after Christ, in and through Christ, and not before Him; and can never be construed rightly, except as controlled by the radical confession first of all: *Thou art the Son of God; the* I AM, *which was, is, and is to come; the Almighty.* So with the Hypostatical Union. So with the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Atonement, the article of Justification, the Church, the Resurrection from the dead. They are all true, in their proper Christian sense, only in and through Christ. They are true Christologically only, and not in any other sense.

XIX. But while the ultimate principle of Christian faith is in this way no other than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the rule of faith, the medium and measure of its proper exercise, the only sure directory in the end for Christian life and doctrine, is the Divine Revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures. They are "the law and the testimony," by which all truth is to be tried. They are this, however, only through their interior spiritual constitution, only as they are, in the way we have seen, the very presence and power of the same Divine Life by which Christ is declared to be the Light of the world. This it is that constitutes their true internal sense, undiscernible to the natural mind, and makes them to be in truth the "Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." They authenticate and illustrate Christ, only because Christ shines in them everywhere as the Truth of all truth to which they owe their origin. The "spirit of prophecy," we are told, "is the testimony of Jesus;" it flows from Him, and looks toward Him, in every part of the Bible. This reciprocal illumination and witness is no vicious logical circle. It is like the relation between speech and thought, or between body and soul, universally; where each term is intelligible only through the other. The mutual illumination in the case before us holds in what we have just seen to be the peculiar nature of Faith. It is the inmost and highest in man brought into conjunction with the inflowing life of the Lord; a state thus of direct illumination from Him as the Sun of the spiritual universe, which of itself serves then to show the Scriptures in corresponding illumination also, and so to bring into view their true inward power and glory, whereby "they are able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ." This is that *testimonium spiritus sancti* of which so much account was made in the age of the Reformation, and the true idea of which has been so much obscured since. Not man's spirit as such bearing witness to God's truth (a purely rationalistic conception), but the Spirit of Christ made to be in man actually through his faith. Here lay the sin and condemnation of the Pharisees. They made much of the Scriptures, thinking to have in them eternal life: and yet they had no power to see how the Scriptures testified everywhere to the presence of Christ. Why not? Because they lacked the illumination that comes from inward union with the Divine soul of the Scriptures. "Ye have not God's Word abiding in you," Christ says to them; "for whom He hath sent Him ye believe not." The entrance of God's words giveth light, where they are irradiated with this faith; not otherwise. Entering into man in any other way, the sense of the Bible is adulterated and profaned, and the light of heaven in it is turned into thick darkness.

XX. The view now taken of the relation between Faith and the Revelation of God centering in Christ, carries us beyond the dilemma of false authority and false freedom, from the horns of which it has been found often so difficult to escape in the construction of Christianity. One is the Roman scheme, making the outward Church the beginning and ground and measure of all actual Christian faith and life. The other is the Rationalistic scheme, making the Bible to be all this in the like outward way, as a text book of divine instruction on the plane of the natural understanding, the moral and religious sense of which each man is left to work out as he best can in the exercise of his own free will and private judgment. The two schemes come in the end to substantially the same result. They cast down the Word from its true supernatural throne. They rob the living Christ of His indefeasible majesty, power, and glory. They turn the communion of the spiritual world with the natural into mechanism, magical hocus-pocus, or dim gnostic imagination. They quench the heaven-aspiring light of faith, and will not suffer it to rise into the direct light of the Lord; making reason in this way blind also, and turning it over to perpetual melancholy bondage in the prison-house of the Philistines.

XXI. Christianity, completing as it does the true idea of humanity by bringing it into true union with God, is the completion necessarily at the same time of the entire natural creation which finds in man its highest and last sense; in which view then, as the end of all things going before, it must be regarded as dominating and determining, from first to last, the order both of actual existence and of right intellectual conception, for the world at large. It is not the lower anywhere in the scale of creation, that gives origin and support to the higher. On the contrary the higher as principal and chief ultimates itself everywhere in the lower. So up to the very fountain of all things in Him, who came forth from the Father to be in this way the beginning of the works of God. With this must correspond then any true theory or science of the world. The boasted modern *Weltanschauung* which builds its scheme of the universe on the premises of nature (as though these were for man here the *only* data to start with—the only elements to work with on to the end in trying to understand the problem of his own life), is just as irrational as it is irreligious. The only true *Weltanschauung* is that of the Bible, which derives the harmonious whole of creation, in descending order, from that Uncreated Living Wisdom (the source of all other life and light), which "the Lord possessed in the beginning of His way, before His works of old; which was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was." The power of seeing and owning this is *Faith;* and just for this reason, faith in

Christ is the eye of intelligence for man, and the light of all science deserving the name. "Through faith," says St. Paul, "we *understand* (intelligize or see with the mind) that the worlds were framed by the word of God;" so that the visible depends everywhere in truth on the invisible, nature on spirit, and not the reverse. Without the felt practical force of this insight into the actual constitution of the world (which only faith can give), science is blind and philosophy insane.

XXII. Where science owns no allegiance to faith in this way, it is Naturalism; and where it pretends to take in the spiritual meaning of the world in the way of religion, it becomes what we are to understand properly by *Humanitarianism*, the great heresy of the present time. This is the idea of a full completion of the world, morally and physically, in man (who is in fact the immediate completion of nature), without the necessary complement of a higher spiritual life descending into him from the Lord. The theory may set itself, as infidelity, in open opposition to the Gospel; or it may affect to take the Gospel to its bosom, and to be just that form of Christianity which is now needed to save Christianity itself from general wreck, amid the rising billows of modern unbelief. It is not to be disguised that such humanitarian Christianity has taken possession widely of the religious thinking of the world at this time; and that the evil is not confined to the doctrinal heterodoxies that have come down to us from other days, but is eating as a cancer also far and wide into what still claims to be the orthodoxy and true evangelical life of the Church. Without going into details it may be said, that wherever the central mystery of Christ is either theoretically or practically cast down from its throne; where He is not seen and owned to be the Son of the Living God, the fountain of all life and light for men in the most real view; and where Faith is not made to be the answer of the soul, first of all, to this primordial Truth, this Truth of all other truths, serving to join man with the inflowing life of the Lord, and becoming thus in man himself a "well of water springing up into everlasting life;" there, we must believe, the right confession of the Gospel is wanting, and the fine gold of the

Christian Sanctuary has become dim. It is Humanitarianism "sitting in the temple of God, and showing itself to be God." There may be an outward cleaving still in the case to old doctrines, regarded as technicals of the faith once *delivered* to the saints; but the doctrines are dead, having no root in the Living Christ (mere εἴδωλα, simulacra, pallid corpse-like abstractions, 1 John v. 21); and so are ready always to go up like the crackling of thorns before the fire of skeptical criticism. Or it may be, the whole idea of doctrine and mystery has been given up, under the plausible notion that all true religion has to do at last only with a good life, and what we may call the spiritual culture of man from the plane of his simply human life as such. As if the second table of the Law hung not forever from the first table! As if there could be any true morality for man without true religion! As if the life of humanity might be imagined capable of completion in any way, without being apprehended, and raised as it were above itself, by the eternal life which God hath given to us in His Son! Under either view, that of dead doctrine or that of no doctrine, the mystery of error here described comes to the same thing. Antichrist, it is in both forms, working and warring against the only true idea of Christ.

XXIII. That this true idea of Christ is indeed the question of all questions for the age, and the question toward the right solution of which all the inmost powers and deepest needs of the age are, with growing urgency, now pressing from all sides, is coming to be more and more plain to the observation of the thoughtful every day. Science, politics, and morals, believingly or unbelievingly, are forced to do homage to it. No theology has living interest, no confessionalism is more than a grinning skeleton of dry bones, apart from it. All the issues of faith and infidelity, spiritual life and spiritual death, are heading themselves together here, in the grand heaven-and-earth moving interrogation of our Lord Himself: "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" Who is He as related to God? Who is He, and what is He as related to humanity and the world?

XXIV. The right knowledge and acknowledgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the view we have now taken of what He is as the full and only visible Manifestation of the otherwise invisible God, the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and that which necessarily goes along with this, the right idea, namely, of what true saving faith is on the side of man, as first of all a direct looking to and coming to the Lord beheld in such Divine Majesty, whereby room is offered for the inflowing of truth, righteousness and life, in the most real way, from His presence; these two in union—are they not, beyond all else, what the critical questionings and confusions of this last time of the Church are plainly forcing into view more and more from all sides, as the only true answer to the great world-problem with which they are concerned? Here, and here only it would seem, have we any solid ground on which to stand, in the conflict between faith and science, revelation and reason, the real existence of a personal God, on the one hand, and Naturalism, or Nature made to stand for God, on the other hand. Here, and here only, is the way opened for a real coming together of Christianity and Humanity, Religion and Morality, in the historical life of the world. Here in its only true beginning, must theology find also its true end. Here only can the strife of doctrines, the *odium theologicum* of religious systems and schools, be made to cease. Here only if ever, can the war of sects and confessions so much as *begin* even to look toward the unity and catholicity of a genuine church life. One Lord Jesus Christ the Son of the Living God, to begin with; and so one faith, one worship, one life. To talk of negotiating or bringing to pass Christian orthodoxy or catholicity in any way other than this, is but hypocrisy and sham. As He is our Life, so He alone is our Light also and our Peace.

ART. II.—SCRIPTURE VIEW OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MT. ALTO, PA.

THE subject of Divine worship, whether viewed in its own nature, or in its relation to the spiritual welfare and edification of God's people, must be regarded as a matter of the highest importance. Whatever, therefore, in any way serves to throw light on this subject, or contributes, in the least, to the solution of this interesting problem, is worthy of attention. We propose, accordingly, in this paper to discuss the general subject of Divine worship, mainly, however, in a Scriptural point of view; and in doing so, we, shall carefully question the Sacred Writings, and elicit from them, as the highest authority, whatever light they may afford on this interesting question.

We take for granted, what, we believe, is generally assumed, that neither in the earlier pages of Holy Writ, nor in the writings of the New Testament, is there any formal instruction given on this subject, nor any definite and fixed order of worship prescribed, nor even any general principles proposed upon which an order of worship or offices of devotion are to be constructed. Whatever is found relating to this subject, except in connection with the legal or Mosaic economy, comes before us simply in the way of actual history or incidental reference; and only by a careful examination of these incidental allusions and historical notices, do we propose to construct some kind of a scheme of worship, and to offer some plausible suggestions on the subject of common prayer or public devotions.

In accordance with our general assumption, then, we remark that the earlier portions of Holy Writ, dealing, as they do, with primitive times and primitive customs, and being distinguished by great simplicity, throw but little light on the subject in hand. The patriarchal period furnishes, so far as our knowledge extends, only a few cursory and indistinct hints in reference to the mode of worshiping the Supreme Being; and these few notices, even, have reference mainly, if not exclusively, to private worship—to the devotions of pious and God-fearing persons in their individual capacity. In those early times of childlike simplicity, each one held communion with God directly for himself, or, at most, each in connection with the members of his own family; and, hence, the nature and form of their devotions differ widely from those of the saints in subsequent periods of the Church. The only probable notice we have of public worship, in this primitive period, is found in connection with the mention of Enos, the son of Seth, where it is said: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." It is doubtful, however, whether this memorable passage asserts the inauguration of public and associated worship, or simply states the fact that then a more decided separation took place between those who had hitherto called themselves "the Sons of men," and those who now, first, began to be called "the Sons of God," worshipers of Jehovah, or, "by the name of the Lord," as some would render the passage.

Leaving, therefore, this early period of the Church, as furnishing no satisfactory data in reference to public worship, we pass on to notice the peculiar rites and ceremonies, which were instituted in the time of Moses, and their relation to the devotions of God's people in subsequent times.

That a certain definite form of religious service or public worship was divinely instituted in connection with the Mosaic System, no one can for a moment question. So particular was the Almighty in reference to this point, that the entire inner and outward arrangement of the Tabernacle, and afterwards of the Temple, was of divine origin—in exact accordance with the "pattern" shown to the Jewish Lawgiver, in the holy mount. This peculiar arrangement had distinct reference to the several forms and essential elements of that worship which entered into the established or ordinary devotions of the Sanctuary. Hence we find here a permanently arranged and splendid ritual—with prescribed forms for the celebration of Divine worship, closing probably in all ordinary cases, with the Aaronic benediction. (Num. vi. 23-27). These arrangements, it is true, had reference mainly to the prescribed sacrifices or sacred offerings, and were, as a matter of course, only temporary and typical—looking forward to the offering of the one only true and perennial sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Hence they were in due time to be done away wholly as to form, while the substance only was to remain. Everything, distinctively Legal or Levitical in connection with that extraordinary system, looked forward constantly to a better time coming, as being itself imperfect and preliminary only—of which coming time, however, it was the shadow or image, while the true substance—that of which these prophetic images were the types and shadows—was to come in at the appearance of the great Deliverer. Types necessarily imply anti-types—fulfilments—answering in their essential elements, and in a higher and better form, to these types and shadows, or prophetic images.

The worship of the Sanctuary, as originally instituted by Moses, and in time possibly somewhat deteriorated, was greatly improved under the successive administrations of David and Solomon ; the former of whom, especially, earnestly labored to improve the services of God's house, by appointing a special order of men—the Levites—whose chief duty it was to conduct the devotions of God's people, and to render the services of the Sanctuary more solemn and impressive. For this purpose the use of sacred music, both instrumental and vocal, was extensively introduced and assiduously cultivated—singers and players on instruments having been chosen and organized into regular choirs or courses. This work of liturgical reform and improvement was undertaken, as we are expressly informed, by special divine inspiration ; and, hence, bears the seal of the Divine approbation (1 Chron. xxviii. 11-20). Now what is peculiarly striking about these divinely ordained services, or forms of worship, is, that they are found to be largely responsive. Any amount of evidence can be adduced to establish this point. These fixed forms of devotion had reference to ordinary occasions—to the customary worship of the Sanctuary—as well as to special and extraordinary times and seasons. The beautiful and affecting rites observed in connection with the introduction of the Ark of the Covenant into the Tabernacle, under David (1 Chron. xvi. 1-36), and the still more magnificent service connected with the dedication of the Temple, under Solomon, (1 Kings viii. and 2 Chron. v.-vii.), are sufficient to show the general character of these ancient and imposing services.* These sublime forms of worship, employed on *special* occasions, as well as many others used in connection with the regular and stated services of the Sanctuary, and others privately, are all carefully preserved to us in the oracles of divine truth. A large number of such prayers, used on a great diversity of occasions, and in all possible connections, are found recorded word for word; all of which shows that these prayers were either precomposed for these several special or ordinary occasions, or that they were subsequently written out by inspired men, and thus preserved for the use of future generations. In either case they bear the seal of the Divine approbation, and furnish strong and conclusive evidence—Scriptural evidence—in favor of pre-arranged services and the lawfulness of established forms of Divine worship.

The special point we wish to make, is, that not only for *special* occasions were pre-arranged forms of worship employed, but that for the ordinary services of the Sanctuary, also, during the Mosaic or Old Testament dispensation, certain definite offices of devotion—of an intensely responsive character—were, by Divine ordination, prepared and used in the services of the Tabernacle and the Temple. This circumstance alone, as we have already remarked, is amply sufficient to show their lawfulness; and what was once lawful and right, in connection with a divinely established system of worship, can never essentially and as to substance, be absolutely wrong. In confirmation of this remark, and as a further evidence of the general prevalence of such fixed forms of worship and their lawfulness, we may in addition to the instances already given, refer to the recorded prayers of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 9-20); of Ezra (Ezra ix. 5-20); of Nehemiah (Neh. i. 4-10); of Isaiah (Isa. lxiv. 1-12); of Jeremiah (Lam. v. 1-22); of Daniel (Dan. ix. 3-19); of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 1-19) and many others which might be cited; also that beautiful prayer of David (1 Chron. xvii. 26-27). In fact the entire Book of Psalms is nothing else than a manual of devotions, and was anciently so used in the way of private and public worship. It constituted an essential part of the established Liturgy of the Jewish Church—the book of sacred song, and of devout prayer and praise!

---

* See also 1 Chron. xxiii. 24-32; xxix. 10-20; 2 Chron. xxix. 25-36; Ezra iii. 10-13, and Neh. xii. 24.

Many of these sublime compositions were regularly used in connection with the worship of God—some in the ordinary temple services, and others in connection with festival occasions, and other special and extraordinary services.* Quite a number of these Psalms are, in their structure and spirit, distinctly responsive, and were evidently used in this way by the Israelites,—being sung or chanted, either by the people and the priests or Levites, or by these latter alone, antiphonally.†

When, in the time of Ezra, the Synagogue was, through the instrumentality of this eminent servant of God, originated, the circumstances called for a new and somewhat modified ritual or order of worship. The devotional part of the Synagogue service, as provided by Ezra, was in fixed forms, and withal largely responsive. The most solemn part of the service consisted of the "Shemoneh Esreh," or "eighteen prayers," as they were called. The main petitions, in this collection of public prayers, were offered by the officiating minister, and the responses made by the assembled worshipers, in the form of a confirmatory benediction, answering in substance and general tone to the body of the prayer, or the several petitions. These eighteen prayers, however, constituted but a small part of the regular worship, and came in very much in the same way as do the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed in our Christian Worship. They formed the heart and core of the service.*

---

* So, in connection with the Paschal feast, were used the following Psalms cxiii.–cxviii. inclusive. For other instances see Nevin's Bib. Antiq. Vol. II. pp. 165–182.

† Of this responsive character are the twenty-fourth and one hundred and thirty-sixth Psalms especially. See also Psa. xli. lxxii. lxxxix. cvi.; and Deut. xxvii. 14-26.

Now what we wish to say in reference to this point, is, that our Saviour and His Apostles statedly worshiped, whether in the Synagogue or in the Temple, in these ancient and established forms, and so gave them their solemn sanction. Among all the scathing rebukes and solemn admonitions, which the Saviour administered to the Jewish people, and, especially to their proud and self-righteous leaders—the Scribes and Pharisees—we find not a single word of complaint or disapproval in reference to these ordinary forms of worship. He never charged them with "ritualism," nor warned them against the danger of using such fixed and established forms in their daily or weekly devotions. He regularly attended the worship of the Temple and also of the Synagogue, and took an active part in the services which belonged to them respectively (Luke ii. 22-52, and iv. 16-21). So with the Apostles; they were regular in their attendance upon the Jewish worship, not only during the Saviour's personal ministry, but also subsequent to His death and resurrection, and freely participated in the prayers and ordinary services of the sanctuary (Acts ii. 1–4, and 41–47; iii. 1–11; and v. 12–16). In all their diversified missionary labors, also, the Apostles uniformly visited the Jewish Synagogues and there worshiped God along with their "brethren according to the flesh," and, as a matter of course, in the fixed and ordinary forms of devotion. So far as appears from the sacred record, they did not regard these forms as in any way wrong, nor were their higher and more enlightened Christian feelings shocked and repressed. Apparently, at least, they worshiped in these established forms, freely and without any sense of impropriety, the God of their fathers; and it is reasonable to suppose, that, in the gradual rise of a more distinctively Christian worship, it would naturally be cast in the general mould of the ancient ritual, in so far as these forms themselves were not inconsistent with the higher spirit of the new and perfected religion.

---

* For an account of these "eighteen prayers" or "SHEMONEH ESREH," as they are called, please consult Prideaux's "Connexion," Pars I. lib. vi. See also Horne's "Introduction," Vol. II. pp. 104–107; and Eisenmenger—"Entdecktes Judenthum," for an account of the forms of worship current among the Jews.

Now, in looking at the different forms of worship in connection with the Temple and the Synagogue, respectively, we find those of the former more exclusively confined to the sacerdotal order—consisting mainly in the responsive chanting or singing of certain Psalms by the Priests and Levites, or by these latter alone, while the people either united in these sacred songs, or, possibly, were engaged in silent prayer. The worship of the Synagogue was of a more popular and general character—the people taking a far more active part in these services. Hence the frequent and earnest disputes as to which of these modes of worship, that of the Temple or that of the Synagogue, was chiefly adopted by the early Christians. Roman Catholic writers, we believe, generally persist on giving the preference to the Temple service, as the model for the Early Church, while Protestant writers have insisted with equal uniformity and zeal on the Synagogue service, as the pattern, according to which the worship of the Apostolic and primitive Church was mainly fashioned. The somewhat separate and isolated position which the sacerdotal order occupied in the Temple service would naturally induce Roman Catholic writers to give it the preference, as it seems most naturally to fall in with their own flashy and more imposing ritual. Protestants as naturally prefer the Synagogue worship as normative for the Apostolic and primitive Church, and the ordering of its services. But singularly enough, while this Synagogue worship is intensely responsive, and thus makes full room for the practical application of our favorite doctrine of a universal priesthood and the rights of the people, our modern Churches almost invariably repudiate the responsive element in worship, and confine the active participation of the people almost wholly to the singing, or possibly to singing and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, while the remainder of the worship is confined exclusively to the ministry. This evidently is a gross and unaccountable inconsistency on the part of our modern Churches.

It is practically to surrender the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all Christians in favor of the opposite view, and that, too, on a point where its firm and steady assertion would be of the most vital importance.

But we do not wish to press this point any further now than to express our conviction that this doctrine is not only true, but also highly important in a practical point of view, and should not be tamely surrendered to our spiritual antagonists.

Leaving for the present the Old Testament times, and the several forms of worship in vogue during that ancient and preparatory dispensation, we now pass on to notice some things in connection with the New Testament times, which appear to us highly relevant to this subject. The dawning of the new era brought with it new relations and higher agencies and instrumentalities. John the Baptist came in as a special messenger—as the connecting link between the old and new dispensations, and his position is therefore peculiar. The few notices we have of him are interesting and instructive. He not only continued in the use of the ancient forms of worship, but, as the new order of things required some new forms of devotion more fully and distinctly expressive of the higher sentiments which distinguished this eminent servant of God, he also, among other things, taught his disciples new and additional forms of devotion (Luke xi. 1). What exactly these new features in the worship of John and his disciples were, we cannot tell; but they probably involved some reference to the glorious things which were ready to be revealed—faintly dawning upon the vision of the Baptist himself and of the more advanced of his followers. The disciples of our blessed Lord also felt the need of some appropriate forms of devotion, such as would express more fully the new and higher promptings of their own hearts. Hence they came to our Saviour for like instructions in prayer, suggested probably by his own devotions, and the peculiar force and spirit which distinguished them. "And it came to pass, that, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." And in compliance with their request, "He said unto them, when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven," etc. (Luke xi. 1–5; comp. Matt. vi. 9–13). The conduct of John, and, above all, the conduct of our Adorable Redeemer clearly teaches two things; first, that it is right and proper to use fixed forms of prayer; and, secondly, that such forms may be legitimately and appropriately used in concert, or publicly; for this model Prayer, be it distinctly observed, is designed for associated or united worship, and is clearly distinguished from private prayer, which is mentioned in the same connection, but in wholly different terms. These private devotions are to be attended to in secret, while the particular form of the prayer, or prayers, is left entirely to the discretion of each individual worshiper (Matt. vi. 4–13).

Bearing in mind these facts, which are indisputable, and seeing that Jesus and His apostles regularly worshiped both in the Synagogue and in the Temple, and thus sanctioned by their own example the use of these fixed and responsive forms, we are warranted to conclude with almost absolute certainty, that, in so far as the principle of using established forms of worship is concerned, we are perfectly safe, and that such forms are not in any way antagonistic to the religion of Christ. But the inference becomes far stronger when we bear in mind that all these ancient forms, whether belonging to the Temple or Synagogue service, were strictly preparatory to the New Testament times, and New Testament forms of worship. This view of the case is abundantly confirmed by the subsequent history of the Church—both during the Apostolic and post-Apostolic periods. Incidental references and hints to this effect, as well as more distinct and conclusive evidence, are found scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures. The frequent occurrence of the expression "with one accord"—*ὁμοθυμαδὸν*—as applied to prayer and the worship of the disciples generally furnishes strong confirmatory evidence of the position assumed.* That in the Christian assemblies some responses were used is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 14–17; where the Apostle refers in an informal way to the fact that the worshiper is expected to speak the "Amen" at the giving of thanks. Such an allusion would be utterly inexplicable and meaningless except on the supposition that these responses were customary, and hence perfectly familiar to the brethren to whom the Epistle is addressed. This is precisely what we might have expected from persons, who were reared and spiritually trained in the united and responsive services of the Jewish Sanctuary, and from amidst these hallowed scenes of the Synagogue and Temple worship passed over into the higher and holier sphere of the Christian life and Christian worship. The venerable services, in which they had been trained, were indeed typical only and temporary, and hence destined to pass away in due time, especially those having more particular reference to the offerings in the Temple; but the very nature of a type is such as to require an anti-type, answering in full to the type in substance, at least; so that, while the outward form is changed and left behind, the true inward life and substance remain. The conclusion, therefore, forces itself irresistibly upon us, that, in the New Testament dispensation, which was but the consummation of the Old or legal economy, the worship of the Saints must correspond substantially with that of the ancient and typical system. If it were otherwise the whole aim and object of that system, as disciplinary and preparatory to the New Testament times, would have failed of being accomplished. In this sense, namely, in the sense of the substantial continuance and perpetuation of the Old economy in the New, we must understand that remarkable saying of our Lord: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." While, therefore, the Saviour came to "make all things new," He also distinctly teaches that this renewing of all things consists not in a process of destruction or annihilation, but of consummation rather; just as the child passes into the youth, and the youth into the full-grown man, each successive step in the process leaving behind what is merely accidental and thus suited only to the lower plane; while the inner life and substance are necessarily carried forward, and embodied in somewhat modified forms in the higher and more perfect state. It is so in all departments of life. In the mineral kingdom, even, this process of elevation and gradual perfection takes place under the operations of the law of crystalization. Much more clearly is this process of growth from the lower to the higher and more perfect state seen in the vegetable and animal kingdoms under the silent workings of what is called the plastic power. The same thing holds true in regard to the intellectual and moral world, and also as regards the domain of spirit. Of this last, according to the teachings of our great High-priest, the world of nature is the significant image and prophecy. " So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

---

* As instances of the use of this expression, see Acts i. 14; ii. 1, 46; iv. 24; v. 12; Rom. xv. 6.

That such a process—a *two-fold* process—of elimination of what was strictly temporary and transient in the ancient system, and of the gradual assimilation of what was truly divine and permanent, in reference to the worship of that system, took place in connection with the rise of the Christian Church and of the more distinctively Christian worship, we think, is perfectly clear from what has been already said, and is fully confirmed by the history of the later or post-Apostolic Church. The New Testament itself furnishes abundant evidence, direct and indirect, that the Apostles and other disciples, following the example of their Lord, continued to worship in the Temple and Synagogue, even after His ascension to heaven and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Besides being together " with one accord in one place," waiting for the fulfilment of Christ's promise, which took place " when the day of Pentecost was fully come," they also afterwards " continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," literally in *the* prayers—the established forms of worship. Thus "continuing daily with one accord in the temple," while "breaking bread from house to house," they showed proper regard for the old, while the new and distinctively Christian elements of worship were not neglected. So afterwards, and in like spirit, "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour,"—the time for the stated morning service. Looking at these facts, we are warranted to draw this conclusion, namely, that, in the gradual formation of the Christian ritual or the adoption of suitable forms of worship, whether written or unwritten, the apostles naturally embodied in these forms of devotion many of the better elements of the Jewish worship to which from childhood they had been accustomed, and in the power and spirit of which their spiritual life and character had been formed. Such a conclusion, in the absence of opposing evidence, is forced upon us with absolute and irresistible power; and all subsequent history bears us out in this conclusion. But before passing on to demonstrate historically the gradual rise of such a Christian ritual or system of worship, we wish to call attention to a still more remarkable fact in connection with the New Testament Scriptures and its relation to Christian worship. We refer to the several scenes in the worship of heaven, as brought to our notice in the vision of St. John.

When in the Isle of Patmos "for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ," the beloved disciple was favored with a most remarkable and singularly instructive vision of heaven—of its blessed inhabitants and the nature of their worship. The scenes which passed before the vision of the holy Seer, as he gazed into the open heavens, were grand and imposing in the highest degree, and in striking contrast with the tame and frigid system of worship contended for by the champions of modern orthodoxy. We find these several scenes brought together and carefully classified by the late Dr. Harbaugh, in his Work on the Future State.* In some introductory remarks the sainted author very beautifully says: "Our faithful Saviour has not forgotten to draw for us some pictures of heavenly worship, which 'He sent and signified by His angel unto His servant John;' who bare record of the Word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. In his vision there is a sublime mingling of earth and heaven—the groans, trials, and longings of 'the Church that waiteth for Him,' and the victorious shouts and thankful songs of 'the Church which is around Him.'—From him who had such visions of the upper sanctuary, we may certainly learn something of the services which make up the heavenly worship."

---

* Vol. III. pp. 308–326.

As a specimen of these celestial scenes, on which it behooves us earnestly to meditate, we here insert what may be called the first vision; and not to incur the charge of marring this beautiful picture of the heavenly worship, we shall give it entire, and in the very words of St. John himself—thus:

"After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said "*Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter.*' And immediately I was in the Spirit! and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And He that sat on the throne was to look upon like a jasper and sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats; and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings, and thunderings, and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the throne there was a sea of glass, like unto crystal; and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within:

and they rest not day and night, saying—'*Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.*'

"And when those beasts give glory, and honor, and thanks, to Him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sat on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, '*Thou art worthy O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power: for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created.*'

"And I saw in the right hand of Him that sat on the throne a book, written within and on the back-side, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, '*Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?*'

"And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, '*Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.*'

"And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne. And when He had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sang a new song, saying, '*Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.*'

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, '*Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.*'

"And every creature which was in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, '*Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.*'

"And the four beasts said, 'AMEN.' And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshiped Him that liveth for ever and ever.

"And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals; and I heard as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, '*Come and see.*'"—And so at the opening of the second seal, and of the third, and of the fourth, the several beasts, or living ones, successively said, "*Come and see.*" And at the opening of the fifth seal, John "saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, '*How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?*' And white robes were given to every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled."

Quite a number of such scenes might be adduced from this book of wonders, showing the intensely responsive character of the heavenly worship: but this one must suffice.* In like scenes we, too, shall hereafter take part; and the worship in the sanctuary on earth is preliminary to that of heaven, and designed to prepare us for that higher and purer worship in which the redeemed from among men, and the countless hosts of heaven are represented as taking part. And can any sane man, now, imagine that our worship on earth, instituted for the express purpose of fitting us for heaven and its blessed worship, must be wholy different in form from that of heaven, and thus be rendered virtually a useless service, so far as preparation for heaven is concerned? Such a supposition is perfectly monstrous, and must refute itself in the view of all reasonable and thoughtful men. No presumption is more unlikely than this, or less entitled to regard. It is indeed hard to conceive how any man, with ordinary intelligence and piety, can be so foolhardy as to deny the propriety of an orderly and responsive form of worship, such as employs the blessed angels, and the redeemed from among men, in heaven!

---

* See also Rev. vii. 9–17; viii. 1-5; xi. 15-18; xvi. 4-7; xix. 1-7.

Whether or not a better way of serving God is at hand, and whether this or the other system of worship is to be adopted, or whether both systems are to be combined, that is quite another question, a matter of mere taste or opinion, in reference to which every man has a perfect right to exercise his own judgment, and decide accordingly. All we contend for, is, the Scripture warrant for an established and responsive order of worship,—its propriety and lawfulness. For the establishment of this point, evidence, varied, full, and abundant, is furnished by the whole history of God's ancient and covenant people—by the special divine appointment and long-continued use of a system of worship, which, especially in its later and more popular form in connection with the Synagogue, was well defined and settled—by the example of Christ and His apostles—by the many incidental notices and casual references found scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures—by the express mention of the responsive "AMEN," and, finally, by the intensely responsive character of the heavenly worship, as brought to our notice in the Revelation of St. John; which heavenly worship is that, as we have already shown, in which we also are finally to take part, and for which we are to be qualified by our united worship in the Church on earth.

So far, then, as the Scriptures say anything at all of Divine worship, either directly or indirectly, they are clearly in favor of some fixed and definite forms of worship, and against the bald spiritualism which characterizes the modern anti-liturgical school. We do not say that such a system of worship is absolutely required. This would be foolish in the highest degree Not everything, that is Scriptural and right at any one particular time, is always and under all possible circumstances Scripturally right and necessary. All that we contend for in this connection, is, that fixed and responsive forms of worship are sanctioned in the Scriptures, and that they constituted the prevailing order of worship for the saints of old, during a period of time and under outward relations distinctly preparatory to the Christian dispensation, and that, therefore, under substantially similar circumstances, the same kind of worship would be perfectly legitimate and proper for God's people at any subsequent period in the history of the Church.

Admitting the typical, prophetic, and preparatory nature of the Old Testament dispensation, and yet denying the substantial continuance of what was essential in that system, in the later dispensation, would be virtually to declare the whole system a failure; or it would be, to use a familiar illustration, like putting a child to an apprenticeship, in order to fit himself for some mechanical calling or occupation, and have his training during the continuance of his apprenticeship, so arranged as to compel him, at its close, to repudiate the whole term of his service and all the skill and experience which he had acquired in the use of implements, in *spite* of the object for which he served his apprenticeship, or, rather, exactly because of his apprenticeship, which, according to our supposition, was only *typical* and preparatory, and hence temporary. But does not the very nature of a typical and preparatory dispensation require us to assume that every thing belonging to such a system has distinct and constant reference to that by which it is to be succeeded, and for the coming of which it is to prepare the way? And these same remarks apply equally to the probationary state on earth, and its relation to the consummated state of the saints in heaven. Hence, what we assumed in regard to the Mosaic system, namely, that it was expressly arranged with a view of preparing the saints of old for the coming in of the New Testament dispensation, and for its higher and purer worship, that we must also assume in reference to their probationary state on earth, namely, that in the providence of God, it was to be so arranged as evidently to prepare us for the consummated state of the saints in glory. And this precisely is the object we have in view in asserting a substantial likeness between Christian worship and the divinely ordained worship of God's ancient people, which, in the deepest sense of the term, was a service "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

The lawfulness, or scriptural character of a responsive worship, is, we think, abundantly established. We now, accordingly, proceed to confirm and illustrate this view of the case by an appeal to the subsequent or post-Apostolic history of the Church. And here we notice first and foremost the uniform testimony of the early or primitive Liturgies. These interesting productions vary considerably in form, but are remarkably similar as to their substantial life and general spirit. This peculiarity proves two things; first, that these ancient Liturgies were not in any way copies one from the other, but sprang, either from the prevailing Christian consciousness of the times, or from Apostolic customs and traditions; and, secondly, that, originating thus in a common Christian feeling, they bear legitimate testimony, singly and collectively, to the deep-felt want and independent composition of these early forms of Liturgical worship.

The testimony of these early Liturgies, especially in reference to that central act of Divine worship—the Holy Communion—is of a most general and important character, coming to us almost simultaneously, and with singular unanimity, from all parts of the primitive Christian world. The early period in which these Liturgical forms are met with, as well as the remarkable resemblance they bear to each other, while in some respects they greatly differ, and also their independent origin and use in countries so widely separated from each other, are all note-worthy and give additional force to the argument in favor of their Apostolic origin, substantially, at least, and as to the essential elements which enter into their composition.

The Rev. M. F. Sadler, to whom we are largely indebted for our knowledge of these primitive Liturgies, after some general remarks on the subject, says very pertinently: "The use of these documents reaches back to a time when there was no central ecclesiastical authority recognized all over Christendom—such as the Pope—to recommend to distant Churches the adoption of any form used by his own Church, and when there was no union of Church and State to compel obedience to any ritual. These Liturgies, while in some respects differing from one another widely, all agree in certain remarkable features. They all contain particular forms of words, which are in substance the same; and the most noticeable of these are forms which the people either use wholly, or in which they take their part along with the celebrant by response."*

The number of these early forms of devotion is very great, and they were in use, as we have seen, in all parts of the world. We have, for instance, the Liturgy of St. James, used in Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine,—that of St. Mark, current in Egypt and adjacent countries—that of the Apostles, as it is called—that of St. John Chrysostom—that of St. Basil—the Coptic of St. Basil also—that of Theodore the Interpreter—the Clementine—the Ethiopic—the Armenian—those of Mesopotamia and Malabar—the Mosarabic, said to have been used in Spain from the earliest times, and representing the ancient Liturgies of Spain and Gaul—the Gallican and the Celtic.

After giving copious extracts from these various Liturgies, and carefully comparing with each other the different forms of expression used, Mr. Sadler concludes thus: "Let us now sum up how matters stand respecting these primitive Liturgies. We have cited them, not merely as testifying to the use of forms, but to the use of certain forms which enable the people to join audibly in the most sacred parts of the service. The New Testament writers have left no directions whatever respecting public prayers. The only thing which we learn from the New Testament, is, that the leading act of Christian assemblies was the 'breaking of bread.'—Well, we have certain (very ancient and widely diffused) documents, called Liturgies—the very word 'Liturgy' signifying a service belonging to the people—all Communion offices—all traceable to the remotest antiquity, in lands as far apart as Malabar and Spain, Gaul and Ethiopia, Armenia and Milan.

---

* "Church Doctrine—Bible Truth," pp. 259-281; where the subject of these Primitive Liturgies is fully discussed.

"These Liturgies contain forms of prayer and praise which are alike both in the words used, and in the fact that particular opportunity is given for the whole congregation to take part in them.

"Who ordered the use of these forms? The most ancient are ascribed to Apostles, or Apostolic men. Of this we may be certain, that no name in the Universal Church of Christ, from the times of the Apostles, has had sufficient weight to induce all Christendom, from Spain to Malabar, to begin their Communion Services with certain words to which the people all the world over give the same response, and, besides this, to cause them universally to adopt as their own the Hymn of the Seraphim, and also to recite the words of our Lord when He instituted the Eucharist, and also to ordain that every Liturgy (except the Roman) should have a specific direction in this place to the people to respond, and also that all should recite the Lord's Prayer, but not without a preparatory prayer for boldness, or, in other words, for the Spirit of adoption, to say, 'Abba, Father.'

"And these Liturgies agree yet further than this; for in seven or eight other matters do they all correspond with one another, as has been shown in such a well-known book as Palmer's 'Origines Liturgicæ.'

"Now, since the Apostles passed to their rest, what Saint, or Patriarch, or Pope, or Emperor, has had the power so to revolutionize the worship of all Christendom, as to induce Churches at opposite ends of the earth to substitute for a fancied primitive worship, in which all was left to the will of the one man who conducted the service, a totally different worship, which, with every variety of detail in particular Liturgies, still rigidly adheres to certain forms, and was characterized by certain very strongly marked features; these forms being such as enabled the people to take their part in the most solemn acts of Divine Service, and the features the very opposite of those which characterize Ultra-Protestant worship?"

Thus far Mr. Sadler. His statements are full and candid, and his reasonings fair and conclusive. It appears to us that it would be a difficult task to undertake either to refute his arguments, or to do away with his statements. The copious extracts which he furnishes from these venerable documents, the striking comparisons which he makes between similar parts taken from these different Liturgies, and the luminous exhibition which he thus gives of the whole collection, all conspire to bring conviction to the mind of the reader. The very existence of these remarkable documents, in the early ages of the Church, furnishes strong presumptive evidence in favor of the ground we assumed, in our brief review of the Scriptural testimonies, in support of responsive forms of worship, having been, if not formally established, at least, impliedly sanctioned. It is hard to conceive how such a number of Liturgical forms, originated and used in different and widely separated countries, showing by their variations an independent origin, and, yet, by their striking resemblances, testifying to a common parentage, could possibly have come into being except on the supposition, that, in principle, at least, they are found in Holy Scripture, and sanctioned by the example of our Lord and His Apostles. The frequent recurrence of the responsive "AMEN," and the "HALLELUJAH," and other Scriptural forms of speech, seem evidently to point back to the sacred writings, and especially to the Psalms—the book of devotions for the Church on earth in all ages, and to the Revelation of St. John—the repository of some instances of the devotions of the saints on high, who worship the same God in that temple "not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."*

The testimony of these early Liturgies, in the view of some, might possibly appear suspicious because they are brought to our notice in the work of an English Churchman. But when the documents themselves are furnished for inspection, it matters not who brings them before us. Our judgment, in such a case, is based not on the ecclesiastical connection and sentiments of the author, but on the nature of the documents themselves. But any amount of corroborative evidence is furnished by other sources wholly beyond suspicion on this account. Even such a man as Coleman, though thoroughly Puritanic in his views, and evidently anxious to break the force of the evidence which history bears to the prevalence of Liturgical forms of worship in the primitive period, is constantly testifying to the positions here assumed. In speaking of the worship of the early Christians and its freedom from ostentation, he says: "Their prayers were accordingly offered in the greatest simplicity, and as far as possible in the phraseology of Scripture. This artlessness and elegant simplicity appears in striking contrast with the ostentation and bombast of a later date. This contrast appears equally great also in the *brevity* of these prayers. It was a maxim in the primitive Church, that many words should never be employed to express what might be said in a few. So manifest was this excellence, that Basil, Chrysostom, and Gregory the Great, successively attempted to abridge the formularies of the Church, and restore their early simplicity and brevity.—Every Church, whether national or individual, prescribed its own mode of worship. In many instances the prayers of the Church were merely submitted to the examination and approbation of the Bishop. Beyond all question, the use of a Liturgy and Ritual was at first wholly voluntary. This subject is discussed at length by Bingham, who maintains that a Liturgy and set forms of prayer were used from the beginning, but admits that each Church was at liberty to form its own Liturgy, and that the prayers were probably uttered *memoriter*, and continued for one or two centuries by *tradition*, before they were committed to writing."*

---

* See especially also; Num. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 14-26; 1 Chron. xvi. 36; Psa. cvi. 48; Rev. xix. 1-4; and xxii. 20.

---

* "Antiquities of the Chris. Church," pp. 210, 211.

These extracts fully admit the existence of primitive Liturgies or fixed forms of worship; and their simplicity and brevity, which distinguish them in these respects favorably from *later* productions, would seem to refer their origin to a very early period—as early, we think, as that to which they are referred by Mr. Sadler. Coleman's view respecting the use of the Lord's Prayer, in the early Church, is singularly suggestive. He says: "In every view of the subject the assertion that this prayer was used by the Apostles, or their immediate successors, must be regarded as arbitrary and groundless." This language is used in opposition to the views which he says were entertained by some writers, namely, "that it was a prescribed form, to be used, not only by His disciples, but by believers in every age and country," like the prescribed form "in which Baptism is to be administered"—"that it was an epitome of the Jewish Liturgy which was at that time extant"—"that the several parts of this prayer are supposed to be the very words in which the several prayers of the Jewish service began, and that the whole was embodied by our Lord as a substitute for so many long and unmeaning prayers." Having expressed his dissent from these views, he makes the following significant statement: "Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, fully concur in testifying to the use of the Lord's Prayer in the second and third centuries.—Tertullian declares it to be not only a form prescribed by Christ for all ages, but asserts that it contains the substance of all prayer, and is an epitome of the whole Gospel. Cyprian repeats much the same sentiments, acknowledging Tertullian as his guide and instructor, and often explaining more fully the sentiments of that author. He calls the Lord's Prayer—'Our Public and Common Prayer.' Origen also has a long treatise on the same subject, in which he says that this was a prescribed form containing all that the true Christian ever has occasion to pray for. Authorities without number, to the same effect may be accumulated from writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The use of the Lord's Prayer, in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, was restricted to the faithful only, and was denied to

Catechumens. By Chrysostom it was styled '*Εὐχη τῶν Πίστων*' —the Prayer of the Faithful."*

In reference to the use of the responsive "AMEN" and of the "HALLELUJAH," Mr. Coleman gives the following account: "'AMEN.' This, in the phraseology of the church, is denominated 'orationis signaculum,' or 'devotæ conscionis Responsionem,' the token for prayer—the response of the worshipers. Justin Martyr is the first of the Fathers who speaks of the use of this response. In speaking of the Sacrament, he says, that at the close of the benediction and prayer, all the assembly respond 'AMEN,' which in the Hebrew tongue is the same as 'so let it be.' According to Tertullian, none but the faithful were permitted to join in the Response.—In the celebration of the Lord's Supper, especially, each communicant was required to give this Response in a tone of earnest devotion. Upon the reception, both of the bread and the wine, each uttered a loud 'AMEN,' and at the close of the consecration by the Priest, all (likewise) joined in shouting a loud 'AMEN.'—At the administration of Baptism, also, the witnesses and sponsors uttered this Response in the same manner.—'HALLELUJAH.' This was adopted from the Jewish Psalmody, particularly from those Psalms (cxiii.-cxviii.) which were sung at the Passover, called the 'Great Hillel,' or 'Hallel.' It was this that our Saviour sang with His disciples at the institution of the Sacrament. The word itself is an exhortation to praise God, and was so understood by Augustine, Isiodorus, and others. The use of this phrase was first adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by other Churches. But the use of it was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whitsunday."†

The numerous other Liturgical forms, current in the early Church, which the author discusses, we shall not be able to review in this paper. They can be examined here, or in any other work on Christian Antiquities—especially in Bingham's great work, or in the work of Mr. Sadler already referred to, and used in connection with this discussion.

---

* Antiq. Chris. Ch., pp. 212, 216.

† Antiq. Chris. Ch., pp. 218, 219.

We here take leave of the two popular authors, Coleman and Sadler, standing as they do, at the two opposite poles of the theological world, and close this part of our subject by a few extracts from a more familiar, and, for the general reader, less suspicious author. Dr. Schaff,* in speaking of the worship of the early Christians, says: "The disciples assembled at first in the temple, and followed as closely as possible the venerable forms of the Jewish Cultus, which in truth were divinely ordained, and were an expressive type of the Christian worship. So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, scrupulously observed the Sabbath, the annual Jewish feasts, and the whole Mosaic ritual, and celebrated, in addition to these, the Christian Sunday, the death and the resurrection of the Lord, and the Holy Supper." On the general subject of prayer, among the early Christians, our author speaks thus: "That, besides free prayer, according to special wants and circumstances, of which we have an example in the fourth chapter of Acts, they used also standing forms, may be inferred with certainty from the Jewish usage, from the Lord's direction respecting His model Prayer, from the strong sense of fellowship among the first Christians, and, finally, from the liturgical spirit of the ancient Church, which could not have so generally prevailed, both in the East and in the West, without some Apostolic and post-Apostolic precedent." In connection with his remarks on the Sacred SONG, "as a form of prayer, in the festive dress of poetry and the elevated language of inspiration," he also refers to the "specifically Christian psalms, hymns, doxologies, and benedictions," which entered into the worship of succeeding centuries, as well as "the lyrical and liturgical passages, the doxologies and antiphonies, of the Apocalypse."

On the responsive character of the primitive worship we quote the author's extract from Justin Martyr, who, in his Apology for the early Christians, giving a description of their Public Worship, as it stood about the year 139, beautifully says: "On Sunday a meeting of all who live in the cities and villages is held, and a selection from the memoirs of the Apostles (the Gospels) and the writings of the prophets (the Old Testament) is read, as long as the time permits. When the reader has finished, the president, in a discourse, gives an exhortation to the imitation of these noble things. After this we all rise in Common Prayer. At the close of the prayer, as we have before described, bread and wine with water are brought. The president offers prayer and thanks for them, according to the power given him, and the congregation responds the 'AMEN.'"

---

* His. of the Christian Church, pp. 118, 120, 121.

On the expression, "according to the power given him," or "with all his might," as others translate it, Dr. Schaff, in an appended note, remarks that the passages or different renderings —"in no case contain any opposition to forms of prayer, which were certainly in use already at that time, and familiar without book to every worshiper; above all the Lord's Prayer. The whole liturgical literature of the fourth and fifth centuries presupposes a much older liturgical tradition. The prayers in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions are probably among the oldest portions of the work."

After giving us Justin Martyr's beautiful description of the Holy Supper, with its "kiss of peace," and its offerings of "praise, and glory, and thanksgiving to the Father of all," its responsive "Amen" by the assembled worshipers, and its "customary collection" for the poor saints, our author makes the following just remarks: "We are not warranted in carrying back to this period the full liturgical service, which we find prevailing in striking uniformity in essentials, though with many variations in minor points, in all quarters of the Church in the Nicene age. A certain simplicity and freedom characterized the period before us. Even the so-called Clementine Liturgy, in the seventh book of the pseudo-Apostolical Constitutions, was probably not composed and written out in this form before the fourth century. Yet by the third century a tolerably uniform practice must have arisen, and spread by oral tradition; otherwise the later Liturgies were historically unaccountable."*

---

* Schaff's Hist. Chris. Church, pp. 382, 383, 391, 392.

That, in a general way, the views and sentiments here enunciated, and fully sustained by the several writers just quoted, were also generally adopted by the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, can, we think, be clearly and incontrovertibly established. The whole history of that extraordinary movement is characterized by a strongly-marked Church-feeling, and a constant recognition of the Liturgical spirit of the early or primitive Church.

The Lutheran Church, embracing, as it did, the greater portion of the European Continent, is, in its original form, wholly in favor of a Liturgical form of worship. The Church of England is notoriously on the same side; and has, in fact, always been one of the chief standard-bearers among the friends of a higher and more churchly form of Christianity. The Reformed Church, all the world over, was originally in favor of a Liturgy, although in the nature of the case, it was at no time so firmly and so steadily devoted to the use of a full and responsive service as the other two divisions of the Protestant Church already mentioned; and, it must be confessed, that several branches of the great Reformed family very soon became shaky and ingloriously surrendered their original position, as respects the use of an established order of worship in any way commensurate with the spirit of the primitive Church, or even of the Church of the Sixteenth Century. But that its original position was at least tolerably high, and that the spirit of this original position long lingered in the Church, and from time to time made itself felt, if not successfully, at least, in honest and earnest efforts suitably to regulate the public worship of God's house, can be clearly demonstrated and established by any amount of proof and of argument.*

Look, for instance, at France and French Switzerland, where the genius of Calvin first presided, and afterwards that of Beza, —the territory where Farel, flinging defiance at every form of ancient order and authority, and preaching, in fiery eloquence, against every thing, which, in his estimation, opposed the progress of the Gospel, or stood in the way of a radical reformation; and where, in the wide world, could you find a soil less suited for the growth of a liturgical, mild, and genial form of Divine Worship? And yet, here, in this uncongenial soil, and amidst these unfavorable circumstances, and under the supervision and by the agency mainly of the stern and relentless Calvin, a Liturgy was gotten up, as early as 1543, and for a long time was able to maintain its position in the Church. Look, too, at Switzerland proper, the land of free thought and independent action, where the more genial, but, at the same time, thoroughly radical Zwingli held undisputed sway during the opening period of the Reformation. One of the first things he did was to construct an order of worship or Liturgy (1525) for the administration of the Holy Communion. This service is distinguished for its admirable simplicity; and, what is so singular, is, that it is intensely responsive, in fact, wholly so from beginning to end. The service was either recited or chanted by the minister and the people antiphonally. The first sentence being spoken by the officiating minister, the other by the men, and the third by the women; and then the service, in its several parts, is continued alternately by the men and the women, the final response or solemn "AMEN," at the close, being spoken by the men and women conjointly. The Service includes, besides the Scripture Lessons, the words of institution, special prayers, and other minor points, the "Gloria in Excelsis," the "Apostles' Creed," the "Lord's Prayer," and the one hundred and thirteenth Psalm, and, finally, a brief thanksgiving, and the dismission of the congregation.*

---

* For a masterly discussion of this whole subject, see Dr. Harbaugh's "CREED AND CULTUS," in Tercentenary Monument, pp. 231-295.

When, afterwards, a more thorough organization of the Reformed portion of the German Church took place in 1563, along with the Heidelberg Catechism, appeared also the Palatinate Liturgy—provision being thus made not only for the inculcation of sound doctrinal views, but, what was of equal importance, also, for the cultivation of a sound devotional spirit and the pure worship of God. That Liturgy is manifestly responsive in character, though less decidedly so than that of Zwingli. Provision, however, is made for the active participation of the people in some of the most solemn parts of the worship—being expressly called on to repeat with the minister certain portions of the service. In some of the later editions of this work, it is true, the language is toned down considerably, in some places; but even in the more recent copies of this Liturgy, as well as in other Manuals of Devotion, such as the different Church-Agendas, and especially in the Marburg Hymn Book, of 1746, —a copy of which, reprinted in 1770, is before us—does this responsive element make itself felt. Here we have, in fact, almost everything of an essential character that enters into the composition of our present Order of Worship, even down to the Litany, with its manifold responses, and hearty participation of all the worshipers.

---

* For a translation of this oldest Reformed Liturgy, see Mercersburg Review, 1857, pp. 594-600.

The Scotch Church also had a Liturgy originally; but it soon went by the board. That this should be its fate under the peculiarly unfavorable influence exerted by the relentless spirit and fiery preaching of John Knox, is not at all strange. How could anything of a delicate and genial nature survive in the atmosphere of the stern, radical, and merciless activity of the Scotch Reformer! And yet the Presbyterians of the century following seem to have been more favorably inclined towards a judicious order of worship, as is seen in the repeated efforts which were made so to revise and modify the Book of Common Prayer as to adapt it to the use of the Presbyterian Churches of England.* Other evidences of the lingering remains of this liturgical spirit, which originally pervaded the entire Protestant Church, are furnished by the ever recurring efforts made both in England and on the Continent to get up suitable manuals for the conduct of Public Worship. New bodies of Christians, springing up from time to time, exhibited more or less of this original spirit. So, for instance, the Methodist Episcopal Church early adopted an order of worship very much like that of the Church of England from which they had seceded. The edition of 1784, which lately fell in our way, appears, from the cursory examination we could give it, to be but a revised and expurgated reprint of the English Liturgy. We have also in our possession a German translation of a Liturgy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, printed, according to a statement made in the preface, in 1804, and published in German by the adv ce of Bishop Asbury and the Philadelphia Conference, in 1808, which contains full and appropriate offices for the administration of the Sacraments, the ordination of Church officers, and other ministerial acts, special and ordinary.

---

* Anton Wilhelm Boehmen's "Reformation der Kirche in England," pp. 635-654, 1042-1106. See also Dr. Krauth's "Liturgical Movement in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches," Mer. Review, 1869, pp. 599-647; where the following works, bearing on this subject, are cited, namely:

(1) Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies; Historical Sketches. By a minister of the Presbyterian Church. 12mo. pp. 260.

(2) A Book of Public Prayer. Compiled from the authorized formularies of Worship of the Presbyterian Church, as prepared by the Reformers Calvin, Knox, Bucer, and others. With supplementary Forms. 12mo. pp. xxiii. 360.

(3) A Manual of Worship, suitable to be used in Legislative and other public bodies, in the army, &c. Compiled from the forms, and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian Denominations, &c., 18mo. pp.—

Besides the several Christian bodies of a later date, already referred to, we must yet mention the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, or Moravians, for whose use a very full and excellent Liturgy was prepared and is still extant. And with these good people the Liturgy is not a dead letter or useless relic. Practically it forms the very life and soul of their religious worship. They use it constantly in connection with their Sunday and other services; and use it, as every Liturgy ought to be used, *responsively*—entering with a spirit of most earnest devotion and fervent piety into these beautiful offices of Divine Worship.

Consider, also, the whole structure of German Christianity, with its Sunday and Holy-day services always running in the order of the Church-year, with its glorious old Chants and Hymns and Sacred Carols, its Manuals of Worship, and Prayer

---

(4) The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the Westminster Divines, A. D. 1661. Edited by Charles W. Shields, D.D. With a Historical and Liturgical Treatise. 12mo. pp. xxiv. 637, 188.

Books for the use and edification of pastor and people, its huge volumes of practical sermons on the Gospels and Epistles, its thorough Catechetical instructions, and solemn confirmation and communion services; and, then, say whether or not these things are of the same order with what now claims to be the only legitimate succession of Evangelical Protestant Christianity. Alas, the bare mention of such a pretence is rank with absurdity. Between the Protestantism of the Sixteenth Century and this modern one-sided reproduction of it, " there is a great gulf fixed," and the judgment of this latter, on the subject in hand, is of little or no account when pitted against the sounder and vastly more Scriptural views and sentiments of the Sixteenth Century, and, still less so, when alleged against the Liturgical spirit and earnest faith of the primitive Church, touching on the Apostolic period, and all aglow with the zeal and fervor of its first love!

Even in the most recent times, the Church in Europe, distracted and weakened, as it is, by the extensive prevalence of Rationalism, yet deeply feeling its serious departure from the faith and practice of the fathers, has shown some signs of a desire to return again to the ancient and better state, which the Rationalistic age had repudiated in favor of its bald intellectualism and sugar-coated infidelity. Strenuous efforts in this direction were made only a few years ago in Switzerland, and quite recently in France. And singularly enough, in both instances, the conservative and believing part of the Church proposed restoring again to the people a portion, at least, of their Liturgical worship and churchly inheritance—the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and the offices for the celebration of the Holy Communion; the very things for which many earnest and devoted men in the Reformed Church of this country have been contending for years amidst fierce opposition, abuse, and endless misrepresentation.

This violent opposition on the part of many, has been aroused and their unchristian conduct justified, ostensibly, on the ground of a fancied agreement between the early Reformed Liturgies and their own arbitrary and unchurchly version, or *perversion*, rather of their genuine teachings; but no presumption could will be wider of the mark than this. That these early Reformed documents contain a full responsive service, such as we find in the Order of Worship, for instance, no one pretends to say. Had there been any such Liturgy at hand, surely no efforts would have been made to get up a new one. The old Palatinate Liturgy was found to be defective in some respects, and wholly unsuited to the exigencies of the present time; hence the effort to construct a new Order of Worship, which should meet, if possible, the wants of the present advanced state of the Church. That such changes and improvements in the outward forms of worship are perfectly consistent with the original spirit and genius of the Reformed Church, as well as with her constant practice in past ages, is too manifest to admit of an argument. Any one doubting this fact can fully satisfy himself by examining the exhaustive article of Dr. Krauth, referred to in the note on a preceding page. On this very ground, indeed, we have admitted, that in the later issues of the Palatinate Liturgy, for instance, the language, in reference to several important points, is toned down considerably. But it must be remembered that these admitted changes in the later worship were made during the darkest and most dismal period in the history of the Reformed Church. The heartless and stern intellectualism of the Seventeenth Century naturally called forth a reactionary movement in the form of Pietism; and this subjective pietism, however valid and praiseworthy as over against a lifeless formalism, gradually and just as naturally passed over into a practical depreciation and disregard of the Church Formularies; and, finally, when its unsubstantial fires were fully expended, just as naturally again, into the cold and dreary regions of Rationalism. Along with the repudiation of the established forms of worship or Liturgy the life and doctrines enshrined in those consecrated forms, also, went by the board. Whether the gradual decline of the early Liturgical spirit, and the general disrelish for such an evangelical order of worship, produced the cold and dreary system of Neology, or whether Rationalism, with its practical rejection of Jesus Christ and

His redeeming work, was father to the prevailing disrelish of these sound and evangelical forms of worship, in which the great facts of redemption were constantly held up and firmly asserted, is a matter of no consequence. Enough that the two movements—a gradual decline in Liturgical worship, on the one hand, and the steady growth of Rationalism, on the other hand, ran parallel with each other; and, finally, ended in the almost total subversion of Christianity and the Church.

But, in the midst of all these changes, the original Liturgical spirit, as we have above remarked, still continued to exist and to make itself felt; and the consequence was, that, during all those dreary ages, as well as in the times more immediately subsequent to the Reformation period, Liturgies or fixed forms of worship, though of different degrees of merit, occasionally made their appearance. And when there was apparently no formal Liturgy at hand for the use of the Church, the necessary elements for a Liturgical service were gathered up and embodied in their current Hymn-Books. Of this fact any amount of evidence can be furnished. Such a massive work as that of Dr. Daniel, for instance, entitled "Codex Liturgicus" is alone sufficient to put the question forever at rest. It is an admirable and enduring monument, both of the industry of the learned author, and of the extensive prevalence and extraordinary fruitfulness of the Liturgical spirit in the Protestant Churches of Continental Europe, and forms, in connection with Dr. Ebrard's more recent work on the same general subject, an unanswerable argument in favor of a fixed and permanent order of worship in the Church of Christ.

What we have now been trying to show in this paper, is, that the ancient Jewish Church had a divinely appointed and fixed order of worship in use, first, in the Tabernacle, and, then, in the Temple, during a period of fifteen hundred years—that the more devotional parts of this divinely established order, though in a somewhat modified and more popular form, were transferred to the synagogue, at its establishment in the time of Ezra, or soon after—that our blessed Saviour and His Apostles statedly worshiped in these ancient and venerable forms, both in the Synagogue and in the Temple—that many incidental references and casual allusions, scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures, give sufficient intimations of the constant recurrence of such common or united services, among the disciples, as a fixed order of worship, whether written or unwritten, alone secures, and that they, especially in their public assemblies, used the responsive "AMEN," according to ancient Jewish Custom (Acts ii. 42; Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16,)—that this style of worship, 'praying with the spirit, and praying with the understanding also,' on the part of the Apostolic Church, was the legitimate fruit and outgrowth of the divinely ordained worship of God's ancient people, which, like the entire system of which it formed a part, was, in its very nature and design, *typical*, and thus preparatory to the New Testament order of things—that this advanced Christian state, with all its services, was again preparatory to the heavenly worship, which, as we have seen from the vision of St. John, is intensely responsive, and thus furnishes presumptive evidence, at least, that the worship on earth, which is designed to prepare us for the heavenly worship, is, and, of right, should be responsive—that the primitive Church, immediately succeeding that of the holy Apostles and their "companions in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ," worshiped in fixed and highly responsive forms of devotion, as fully certified by a multitude of Liturgies still extant, early originated and used in the most distant and widely-separated countries, embracing the whole primitive Christian world—that the spirit of these early Liturgies, at least, if not their forms also, were generally recognized by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and embodied to some extent in their own respective Liturgies or Manuals of Devotion, and, that, during the ages subsequent to the Reformation, this Liturgical spirit constantly existed and made itself felt, from time to time, both in Continental Europe and in England, as also in this country, measurably, at least, during the earliest period of the existence of the Reformed Church; and, that, on the ground of this uninterrupted and well nigh universal prevalence of Liturgical worship in the Church of Christ, we are fully warranted to regard the use of fixed, established, and responsive forms in the worship of God, both legitimate and eminently Scriptural.

How far we have succeeded in our attempt to make good these several points, and so to establish our general position, we leave to the honest and unbiased judgment of our readers to decide. Our argument, especially as to its main features, is strictly Scriptural; and on this solid foundation of God's everlasting Word, interpreted, not in the spirit of a national camp-meeting or of a New England thanksgiving-day, but in the ineffable light and glory of its own Super-human History, we confidently rest the cause of Liturgical Worship.

Honestly and earnestly, but in this only true and legitimate sense and use of the Sacred Writings, do we appeal "to the law and to the testimony," in our argument with those who differ from us; "if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Truth only is worth being contended for. Every thing that is merely human and ephemeral must eventually pass away; "but the Word of the Lord abideth forever."

ART. III.—THE SCOPE AND SPIRIT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.*

BY W. LEAMAN, ESQ., LANCASTER, PA.

FELLOW Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College: Ladies and Gentlemen:—

When, a few weeks ago, I was informed that Judge Mayer, who had intended addressing you to-night, would be unable to be present in consequence of feeble health, and that I should be expected to act in his place, it was natural for me to indulge in a brief retrospect. Reverting to the time of graduation, when *Alma Mater* was left with such equipment for life as I was able to carry from her, and glancing over the years that have since passed, I took an inventory of acquisitions made in the interval for the purpose of discovering whether I had anything to furnish on any topic of so general a character as to be appropriate to the present occasion. And truly the gleanings appeared so pitiful a handful, that my first impulse was to reject the task as having nothing worthy to offer you. But as we may easily paralyze ourselves by a too rigid self-criticism, it occurred to me that you might possibly be somewhat interested, were I to give you some thoughts and impressions on the scope and spirit of scientific research which have been gathered in the course of rather miscellaneous and desultory readings other than professional, in which natural bent was consulted and followed. It is not my intention to enlarge upon any of the special doctrines or logical methods of science, but to examine with brevity some of the larger ideas which pervade all its operations, the attitude it assumes toward the general body of knowledge, the mental atmosphere in which it habitually dwells, the moods and emotions it produces, the sympathies and antipathies it arouses. I wish to act the part of a reporter, not of an advocate or a judge. And I hope the theme may not be esteemed one of too high argument, as it seems to have a fitness for the time. For science claims to rule the hour and the era, and that it will continue to hold the dominion of the future. A body of disciplined students are engaged in observing, collating, combining and generalizing facts in all special departments. From these the most important results are taken, and receiving popular and lucid exposition, at length reach the magazines and the corners of the daily newspapers, until each of us may, if it seem fitting, procure a modicum of pangenesis, protoplasm, natural selection, evolution, or whatever may be the last explanation. Scientific theories and teachings are in the process of infiltrating and permeating the whole of society, exciting reflection, disturbing received opinions, meeting in some quarters enthusiastic agreement, and rejected in others with intense repugnance and reprobation. Not only are the intellectual and thoughtful minds being reached, but many of the undisciplined and thoughtless. Shakspeare's melancholy Jaques, who laughed, *sans* intermission, an hour by his dial, at the motley fool who moraled on the time, might now find much food for his merriment, and his lungs might crow like chanticleer.

---

* Alumni Address delivered at Lancaster, Pa, June 24th, 1873. Published by request of Society.

'That fools should be so deep contemplative.'

Doubtless the antics and arrogance of many sciolists who caper in the garb of science are ridiculous enough; but notwithstanding, these are among the signs of the advent and influx of new thoughts, which must be met and examined by all of us who think at all, and either accepted with important modifications of many beliefs, or combated to the best of our abilities. We cannot shout our old and hereditary opinions so loudly; we cannot so fill our ears with conservative cotton, as not to be penetrated by the thinking of the time. The terror produced in many minds will not arrest scientific progress, which is neither to be stopped nor intimidated by indignant protests. Mr. Parke Godwin, of the New York *Evening Post*, at the farewell banquet given to Professor Tyndall prior to his departure for England, in a speech which has been much quoted and lauded, attempted to draw the line between true and false science, assigning to scientific inquiry what he considers its legitimate scope, and saying 'hitherto come, but no farther.' But science will pay but little attention to this, or any similar call to halt. It will persevere in penetrating the territory of knowledge in all directions, adding field to field, in spite of barriers erected and boundaries marked out by outsiders who presume to prescribe its limits. "I have taken all knowledge to be my province," said the first great organizer of scientific methods, Francis Bacon, then in his youth, with calm self-reliance. His followers, too, have taken all the knowledge to be their province, believing with Gœthe, that "Nature has no secret which she does not somewhere lay bare before the eyes of the attentive observer." In order to appreciate these claims, let us get a clear idea of what is meant by science. The most adequate conception which has been reached, is that which fundamentally identifies science with common knowledge, with those rude classifications of facts and experiences which are carried on by children and savages. It reduces this common knowledge to exactness and then proceeds to organize the more complex, remote and recondite phenomena with similar precision, or at least with all the definiteness of which they are capable, for equal certitude is not possible in all the departments of science. It will not rest merely in the region of physical truth, but, traversing that, rises to chemical truth, and extends itself into the phenomena of life, of mind, and of society. But science does not cease with the orderly arrangement of phenomena as they exist at the present time into groups and classes according to the observed relations of likeness and difference; it also examines and considers how the present has grown out of the past, and to what goal things are progressing. Facts must be co-ordinated, not only as they exist together, but as they succeed one another with reference to community of causation. Science classifies, for instance, the present statical relations of the solar system, as a part of its work in the field of Astronomy; states how world is balanced against world, and with telescope and spectroscope shows the external appearances and chemical constitution of the planets and suns about us. It does more. It traces out their origin and development, in accordance with the known laws of matter and motion, from a diffused float, through cycles of aggregation, accretion and separation until existing conditions are reached. We here come upon the Nebular Hypothesis. Again Geology does not stop with ascertaining the contemporaneous physical aspects of the planet which we inhabit, 'a star among the stars,' but goes back through the recesses of a far past when the earth assumed an independent existence, and follows up the transformations effected by the slow, unceasing, processes of condensation, stratification, upheaval by igneous action, denudation, deposition, and solar influences, until we come upon the present distribution and composition of land, water and climate. Then dealing with the subtle permutations and combinations of chemical atoms and forces, science ascends higher and lays its hands upon the problem of the origin of life, and now wrestles with its solution. For it considers life to be a concrete phenomenon, and as such, though the task may be vastly difficult, susceptible of explanation and definition like any other. After life, the germ of protoplasm, has been reached, the special living forms must be accounted for. This Mr. Darwin attempts to do by his theory of the origin of the species by natural selection. But man himself is a special living form, and again we have Mr. Darwin with an explanation of his descent. The facts of mind are dealt with in a similar manner. Psychology does not merely analyze and classify the mental powers of the adult civilized man, but, by uniting the experience of the individual with the experience of all ancestral minds, attempts to furnish a complete interpretation of the phenomena of consciousness; including the intuitions of Space and Time, the so-called Forms of Thought, and Necessary Truths. Further, a man is not only a unit, he is one of mankind, and as such an object of Science. And, at this very hour, a great thinker is elaborating a Science of Society, a Sociology as it has been termed, which shall furnish a philosophy of history, an explanation of the facts of aggregated human life, and the laws of social well-being. The effort may be only initiatory and tentative, and the future may have to set much of it aside, but it illustrates, with clearness, scientific aims and tendencies. The most sacred beliefs of men must pass the test of scientific examination. The grounds of a belief in a Personal First Cause; the existence of an immortal life after the death of the body; and the claims and credentials of any professed revelation, will receive critical scrutiny. In a periodical so common and so extensively circulated as 'Littell's Living Age,' have appeared Max Mueller's dissertations on the "Science of Religion!" Then again, taking the highest and widest generalizations supplied by its special departments, and the profoundest analytical truths which have been obtained, Science furnishes the basis and data of a synthetic philosophy which aims at giving, in a general body of doctrine, an explanation of the totality of phenomena. This philosophy, having its roots deep down in common knowledge, and using the faculties employed in the acquisition of that common knowledge, and constantly making application to a psychology which sits central among the sciences, itself a science, strives to establish a theory of the Universe which shall exclude all unverifiable appeals to intuition, revelation, or supernatural light, and which, in the most elevated regions of thought, and on all ultimate questions, shall secure the same certainty which we have in the lower range of the senses and of immediate perception. For scientific thought gives but little heed to the assumptions of philosophers, who ascend the tripod and ray forth oracles without condescending to render reasons saving that their utterances appear to them to be true and consistent. All thinking must be brought to the crucial test and scrutiny of the ascertained laws of thought, to stand or fall under the application of rigorous logical methods. A certain Frenchman could not demonstrate to his friend that the earth turns round the sun, but he was willing to pass him his word of honor as an assurance that it does. The guarantee might be considered unsatisfactory. Beyond doubt, in matters of science, the word of honor carries but little weight. Science, therefore, claims that its limits are con-terminous with the powers of the human mind for attaining definite knowledge, and will not stop short of that goal. It is an organized mass of facts, ever growing, and ever being purified from errors. Not that it expects to find out all things unto perfection. Science asserts the existence of a transcendent Force, an ultimate and Primeval Power which is inscrutable and unknowable, and of which all phenomena are but the manifestations. It makes the admission, or rather the distinct affirmation, that "positive knowledge does not, and never can, fill the whole region of possible thought. At the uttermost reach of discovery there arises, and must ever arise, the question—What lies beyond? As it is impossible to think of a limit to space so as to exclude the idea of space lying outside that limit, so we cannot conceive of any explanation profound enough to exclude the question—What is the explanation of that explanation?" Knowledge cannot monopolize consciousness; it must always continue possible for the mind to dwell upon that which transcends knowledge." It recognizes an enduring reality which supports all appearances, which is constant under all the changing phenomena.

"The eternal Pan,
Who layeth the world's incessant plan,
Halteth never in one shape,
But forever doth escape
Into new forms."

But here its attitude ceases to be intellectual and definitely cognitive and becomes emotional. Of that Universal Power nothing is asserted except that it exists and that it underlies all experience. It is wholly inconceivable. Scientific research feels itself impotent in the presence of a vast mystery, and makes no proposition regarding it. Science does not deny anything, but it cannot affirm anything, and reverently puts its finger on its lips.

Rejecting, then, the arbitrary assignment of boundaries, and at the same time recognizing the vanity of all attempts to compass absolute knowledge, Science accepts the limits of the finite human mind, and confines itself to the relative and knowable.

Within this area, the conception of *Law* presides over all scientific inquiry. That there is a fixed course of procedure, an order which changes not, in the manifestations of Force, in all events and phenomena throughout the universe, including those of volition, is a conception that science cannot for a moment let fall. The idea is not the product of any particular science, nor of any one line of thought, but of all sciences, and all lines of thought therein. Finding uniformity of relations wherever he has observed, compared and experimented, and looking upon facts not yet organized as matters for future organization, the man of science expects everywhere to find invariable connection and sequence, and cannot believe in, or conceive of, lawless phenomena. There is no chance. There is no fate. But the iron chain of an inexorable necessity runs through all phenomena, in which each effect is linked to its cause by indissoluble bonds. Job's description of the scaly harness of Leviathan might be applied to this rigid cohesion of cause and effect. "One is so near to another that no air can come between them. They are joined one to another, they stick together that they cannot be sundered." This conception of Law excludes all idea of interference. There is no break, no flaw, no unforeseen contingency to be provided for. These laws, sacred from all violation, execute themselves. Introduce any agency external to the universal order, which intervenes in any crisis, or at any instant, or any incalculable agency which is co-working or inter-working with the operation of natural and measurable forces, and there is introduced an unverifiable element. Scientific certainty disappears. In any given effect which may be observed, it becomes impossible to assert what proportion of the result is assignable to the natural causes, and what to the external or alleged co-operating agency. Just as science would become impossible, could either matter or motion arise out of nothing, or disappear into nothing, so it would become impossible if a factor, were admitted, whose operation cannot be known and measured.

Under this pervading conception of the universality of Law, Science everywhere looks for the persistent connection among things. "'The fashion of the world passeth away,' writes Gœthe, whose mind was profoundly scientific as well as poetic. 'I wish to busy myself only with relations that are permanent, and thus give to my mind its first experience of eternity." Science searches for the 'Eternal Verities,' as Carlyle calls them. Truth is its only object. It cannot rest in illusions, but must "see the object as in itself it really is." In that beautiful book, 'Thorndale; or the Conflict of Opinions,' Seckendorf, who represents the spirit of Denial, defends the illusions of mankind, holding that they furnish stimulation and active motive power, and also enfold and disguise the harsh realities of the world and the impotence of man in dealing with them, thus helping to reconcile him to his lot, and to make the rolling years endurable. And it may be the business of poetry to create such, to put out of sight the disagreeable appearances and bring into prominence only the beautiful aspects of things, and even

"To add the gleam,
The light that never was on land and sea."

But science dispels illusions, looks at the object through no diffracting media, but places it in a dry, colorless light. It pursues truth regardless of consequences, and no matter how uninviting its appearance at first may be. "We must follow truth, though it lead to Hades," is its motto. What an amount of adverse and repugnant feeling has been called out by Darwin's theory of the "Descent of Man!" Much of the criticism seems to consist of emotional protests against a history of man's origin, which appears unutterably degrading to him. But science calmly investigates the hypothesis for the sole purpose of ascertaining whether it be true or false, complete or incomplete, and leaves our dignity to take care of itself, knowing full well that, if true, it must be accepted, and that the human mind will find some way of becoming reconciled to the result.

Then again Science is affirmative and constructive, not negative and destructive. It seeks to build up not to pull down. This portion of its spirit is perhaps best discernible in its attitude towards the old and the new, the past and the present, historically considered. The present cannot sudddenly sever its connection with the past. They are causally connected. The beliefs of to-day are the offspring of those of yesterday, and the parent of those of to-morrow. The errors of men cannot be suddenly destroyed by negative criticism, but must be exuviated and cast aside by new truth. The scientist does not go about pointing out to men the absurdities and logical incongruities of their dogmas and creeds. He regards the existing opinions and social institutions as the appropriate results of historic growth, as the inevitable products of the time. Mr. Lecky, in his 'History of Rationalism,' shows that ancient beliefs, such as, for instance, those respecting magic and witchcraft, have not perished so much from direct logical assaults and definite arguments, as from an incompatibility with a standard of belief created, not by the influences arising out of any one department of intellect, but by the combination of all the intellectual and even social tendencies of an age. All these influences generated, as it were, an atmosphere of thought in which the old beliefs could not live. They died of inanition. The scientist recognizes the truth of this. Opinions and institutions may justly live as long as they can. 'The teeth,' it has been remarked, 'are hard and painful to extract in youth, but in old age they fall out of themselves.' Or the matter may be illustrated by the analogy of the process of growth conspicuous in the common sycamore tree. Look under it at certain seasons and you will find the ground scattered with fragments of rind shed from the tree. Observe the cause. A new growth has silently formed beneath the old bark and made room for itself by casting it aside without laceration or violent effort. In this manner, the scientist would have the present arise out of the past. But he is at the same time courageous, and when properly called upon fearlessly expresses his beliefs without mental reservation, leaving them to work what effect they may. He extends the area of positive knowledge to the best of his ability, and then patiently waits until it prevails throughout society. In this spirit all great men have worked in whatever field, who were more careful to lay the foundations of a new state of things, than of overturning the old one. And this attitude is the marked characteristic of the scientific inquiry of the day, differing in this respect from the radical iconoclasm of the last century. The thinking of that time, as exhibited most conspicuously in France, was almost wholly negative and destructive. It constructed nothing, and whatever was useful in it lay in the fact that old errors were swept away and the ground prepared and cleaned for new truth.

Again, science works in a spirit of profound humility. Towards dogma, towards mere authority, its attitude may be haughty, but toward fact and truth it is humble. As says Professor Tyndall of inductive inquiry, "It requires patient industry and an humble and conscientious acceptance of what Nature reveals. The first condition of success is an honest receptivity and a willingness to abandon preconceived notions, however cherished, if they be found to contradict the truth. Believe me, a self renunciation which has something noble in it, and of which the world never hears, is often enacted in the private experiences of the true votary of Science." This characteristic of men of science received eminent illustration in the case of Newton, when testing his discovery of the law of gravitation. Having reached the hypothesis that matter attracts matter directly as the mass, and inversely as the square of the distance, he proceeded to verify it by ascertaining whether it corresponded with the order of observed facts. According to the theory, the moon, at the distance then calculated, in its revolution round the earth must be deflected fifteen feet each minute from the direction of a right line. But observation showed that the deflection was but thirteen feet each minute. Finding this discrepancy, Newton laid aside his hypothesis for many years as inadequate to explain the phenomena. Subsequently, however, it was discovered that the distance of the moon had been incorrectly estimated. Newton then resumed his calculations, and found, after making the necessary corrections, that the law as stated would require that the moon be deflected from its rectilinear path thirteen feet each minute as observation had shown to be the case. Thus was the theory established as the law of gravitation. What a religious self-abnegation was witnessed during those years! What a submission of the pride of intellect to the facts of the universe! For it is difficult in thinking as in conduct to purge ourselves of all selfish considerations. Read the papers on the subject of Sociology appearing currently in the "Popular Science Monthly," and you will get a conception of the obstacles in the way of reaching a perfectly unbiased point of view. Our minds are infested with what Bacon calls "Idols," which can only be got rid of by the most attentive watchfulness, a constant self-denying effort, which itself constitutes a culture of the highest kind. Whoso will search for the truth in the spirit of Science must become as a little child, must have the same freedom from prepossessions, the same sincerity, openness and docility of mind.

Again science works in a spirit of deep *faith.* Of course the word is not used in any restricted theological sense, but as expressing that reverent submission to, and acquiescence in, truth, believing that it is good. Science holds that the profoundest skepticism and infidelity are the idea that the truth can be bad. It was said before that science seeks truth, fearless of consequences, that truth must be followed even if it lead to Hades. But there is no fear that it will lead to Hades. Its face is turned in a quite opposite direction. Science throws itself upon proved and demonstrated truth, upon the abstract law, adhering to it in spite of all adverse appearances. It holds that truth is something distinct from ourselves, something immutable, which it is our business to ascertain, and when ascertained, unquestioningly conform to, for in that conformity will be found our truest happiness and most perfect life. Science sees that nothing can be permanently accomplished except by working in harmony with law. No amount of cunning ingenuity or courage, will enable us to fight successfully the laws of the world. Obedience is the highest prudence, the truest heroism, the greatest wisdom, the deepest religion. Its aspiration might be emotionally expressed in the language which Matthew Arnold is fond of translating from a Greek poet:

"O that my lot may lead me in the path which august laws ordain, laws that in the highest empyrean had their birth, of which Heaven is the father alone, neither did the race of mortal men beget, nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. The power of God is mighty in them, and groweth not old."

An excellent illustration of this scientific faith in the abstract is furnished by Spencer's "Social Statics." The work may be called a Geometry of Morals. Starting from a first principle, immediately recognized by the "Moral Sense," and also inductively established, he proceeds to logically develop it into a series of propositions which shall serve for our guidance in all the departments of social life. All considerations of expediency are put aside, or only called in for the collateral purposes of argument and illustrative proof, and to show how the first principle involves them. He is willing to trust society to the ascertained law, without foresight of consequences, but in the implicit faith that conformity thereto will produce the highest and best possible results. In the concluding paragraph of the remarkable treatise referred to, he says, "And thus, in teaching a uniform unquestioning obedience, does an entirely abstract philosophy become one with all true religion. Fidelity to conscience—this is the essential precept inculcated by both. No hesitation, no paltering about probable results, but an implicit submission to what is believed to be the law laid down for us. We are not to pay lip homage to principles which our conduct willfully transgresses. We are not to follow the example of those who, taking '*Domine dirige nos*' for their motto, yet disregard the directions given, and prefer to direct themselves. We are not to be guilty of that practical atheism, which seeing no guidance for human affairs but its own limited foresight, endeavors itself to play the god, and decide what will be good for mankind, and what bad. But, on the contrary, we are to search out with a genuine humility the rules ordained for us—are to do unfalteringly, without speculating as to consequences, whatsoever these require; and we are to do this in the belief that then, when there is perfect sincerity—when each man is true to himself,—when every one strives to realize what he thinks the highest rectitude—then must all things prosper." This tone of courageous faith, expressed in relation to one of its highest departments, is characteristic of science throughout its whole extent. Again, science aims at being eminently practical. It strives to strengthen man, to make him more adequate to his situation, and to enable him to fight the battle of life more securely. It does not delight to dwell on the negative aspects of human nature, on the imbecility, depravity, or ignorance of man, but searching for such potencies as may be in him, fortifies these, and, by disclosing the conditions in his environment which he must seek or avoid in order to secure good or escape evil, enlarges the range of his adaptation. It is its ultimate function to furnish infallible guidance for all our actions, physical, intellectual and moral, not by giving guesses and opinions, but by showing the uniform connections of coexistence and sequence among surrounding facts, and by discovering the laws, conformity to which will necessarily produce the greatest personal and social happiness. When the more complex, remote and recondite relations of phenomena are distinctly pointed out, and clearly held before our minds, they will guide our conduct with as much certainty as we are now guided by our direct knowledge; for instance, as by our experience that fire will burn, or that bread will nourish.

Though very imperfectly elaborated, such are the scope, spirit and aims of scientific inquiry as I have been able to apprehend them! I may have misconceived the real nature of the subject, and therefore reported incorrectly. I can only be sure that I have given what I have received.

And now let us glance at the mental attitude of those not professedly scientific towards the doctrines of science. Much disturbance of thought and feeling is to be looked for. For it is a truth "that in every man, and in every generation of men, there is a certain inevitable connection of opinions. We hold our views by sets and series. If we espouse one, we will unconsciously let in along with this a little, or it may be a long train of others. A man comes to a conclusion upon some greatly controverted point of science. His eye has possibly never turned aside from the straitened bounds of scientific matter, and yet his single conclusion here leads him insensibly to a whole parcel of conclusions in religious matter or in ethical matter." Changes of opinion, and tone and habit of thought may be wrought in indirect and unexpected ways. Fifty years ago, John Foster, in his "Essay on Popular Ignorance," congratulated himself on the increased introduction of machinery in the mechanical employments, as it would make the laboring classes understand that there is such a thing as physical law, and thus assist in dispelling from their minds superstitious beliefs in omens, charms and witchcraft. And now Dr. Bushnell explains that machinery has so familiarized the same classes with the unyielding laws of matter, that they are led to expect the same fixity in all phenomena, and have no room in their thinking for the supernatural.

Besides every Intellectual belief gathers round it its appropriate feeling, and when the belief is disturbed, suffering is aroused emotionally. The condition of doubt is painful. And these emotions are beyond the control of the individual. They have become a part of him without his consent, and spring up spontaneously under the fitting circumstances. De Quincey shows that the agitation and sorrow of Eloisa under her sin would have been impossible to a vestal virgin of Rome, but was natural and necessary to her, enveloped as she was by the religious atmosphere of Christianity. Now Science, in that part of it which is merely classificatory, does not excite any antagonism or alarm. Botany and Zoology may go on arranging their groups and subgroups, and no protest will be uttered. But it is when we come to the sciences which assume to account for the concrete forms; or when the large generalizations of scientific philosophy are reached, that existing and inherited beliefs are invaded and painful feelings aroused. Such is the case when Darwin promulgates his theory of the "Descent of Man," and when Spencer announces his sweeping and universal law of evolution. These are at once perceived to be at variance with many existing opinions, creeds and philosophies, and opposition and aversion are instantly excited. To many of the best minds of the day, imbued with theology, science and religion appear utterly irreconcilable. To them science appears to be tending headlong toward a materialism, dark, desolate and hopeless, in which all man's noblest thoughts and aspirations shall be dissolved as baseless dreams, leaving a morality of "Eat and drink to-day, for to-morrow we die." On the lower ground of literature, which reflects the more general feeling of the public as affected by the new thinking the expression of despondent moods is frequent, at times freighting the lines of poets with a delicious and infectious melancholy. Tennyson, who sings hopefully in "Locksley Hall," in his "In Memoriam," in which many meditations on life, on man's hopes and beliefs, pass through the shadow of a great sorrow, attains but a struggling faith,

"Behold we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring.

So runs my dream; but what am I?
An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light;
And with no language but a cry."

Again he sickens with the unceasing turmoil and conflict of opinions, and longs for the conscious calm of the "Lotos-Eaters," in a "land in which it seemed always afternoon," to rest and "never wander more." And lastly in a recent sonnet he inquires,

"Is there anything worth the knowing?"

The delicately refined William Morris turns from the problems of the time, "I cannot ease the burden of your fears," is his apology. But he essays to give a few moments of oblivion, and sings a song so enchanting that while you listen you forget

But it is needless to extend the range of illustration. These are but the utterances of widely-prevalent moods. In the midst of the doubts and confusions of this transitional time, Science holds it must continue to calmly do its appointed work. It can but urge loyalty to truth, believing that what is such will in the end survive, and that the truth cannot be evil, nor produce evil. "Fear not the new generalization," says the deep-minded Emerson. "Does the fact look crass and material, threatening to degrade thy theory of spirit? Resist it not; it goes to refine and raise thy theory of matter just as much." Science has its eye on the future, and holds that the highest point of view which the mind of man is capable of attaining will be sufficient for him, giving satisfaction to his thought, stilling doubt, allaying every fear, harmonizing all discord. It feels assured that in the end all will be well, for it is clear that existing beliefs and institutions can only be permanently supplanted, if supplanted at all, by higher ones. Science is full of hope, knowing that,—

> "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs."
> And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns.

ART. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM AS TAUGHT IN THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

BY THE REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D.

Of late the doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Holy Baptism has received special consideration, and called forth earnest discussions, both within the pale of the Reformed Church and to some extent also among other denominations, occasioned chiefly by the able article of the Rev. Mr. Rupp on Regeneration and Conversion. These discussions afford new evidence of the fact that the rationalistic tendencies of the prevailing theology have supplanted the old Protestant faith in the Sacraments as appointed means of divine grace. Claiming to be the faithful representative of Reformation ideas, the religious press of our day, generally at least, denies, respecting the efficacy and necessity of Baptism, what the most authoritative Confessions of the Protestant Church with one voice affirm, and affirms what these confessions explicitly deny. Baptism is the seal of regeneration and of the forgiveness of sins. So these confessions of the sixteenth century all teach; and in this respect they are in harmony with the faith of the Church catholic in every age. But the religious press of our day commonly affirms that Holy Baptism is at most only a significant religious ceremony. The ceremony *symbolizes* forgiveness and the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit; but the subject of Baptism, whether infant or adult, is not made a partaker of any positive spiritual gift through the medium of the Sacrament itself.

Taking the leading confessions of the Reformation period as the standard of true Protestantism, these low views of the Sacraments, and particularly of Holy Baptism, must be set down as unprotestant. They are the modern form of Socinian error.

In the Reformed Church the discussion of the historical question revolves around the Heidelberg Confession. What does this most authoritative formulary of the original Reformed faith teach? Has it any sympathy with Socinian unbelief? Does it give any support to the rationalistic opinions of the last century and of the present day? Or do its teachings harmonize with the faith of the Church as perpetuated from age to age in every branch of her communion?

To this general question we will endeavor to furnish an answer. Let us interrogate the Catechism itself. It devotes six questions to the subject of Baptism. These we propose to take up and consider in regular succession.

The more general doctrine of the Reformed Church, as taught in all her confessions, we presented in an article published in this Review, April, 1868, where the reader will find a collation of the teachings of all branches of the Reformed Church—Swiss, French, German, Scotch, Belgic, and other nationalities. They all affirm substantially the same view of the efficacy of Baptism which is given in our Catechism.

Question 69.—How is it signified and sealed unto thee in Holy Baptism, that thou hast part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross?

Answer.—Thus: That Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise, that I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away.

The terms of this question are connected with question 66, where it is said "*the sacraments are signs and seals.*" The conception of sign and seal runs through all the subsequent questions and answers, though that of seal, or of a sealing transaction, predominates. It is assumed that Baptism does two things: it *signifies* grace, and it *seals* grace to the subject.

How is this done? The terms of the question imply that it is done *in* Holy Baptism. These words, "in Holy Baptism," are significant. They are used in connection with the present tense—thou *hast* part. The language is not, thou *mayest* have part, or thou *shalt* have part in the one sacrifice of Christ. That would imply that Baptism is only a pledge of some spiritual good which is yet future. Nor is the form of the verb *thou hast had part.* The Catechism does not use the past tense. That would imply that divine grace, communicated at some other time and in some other way, has now Baptism added or attached to it by way of certification, as the seal of the magistrate is put on a legal document to certify its validity.

The present tense is used. The construction of the language means that Holy Baptism is a present sealing transaction, or rather, that Christ seals to us in Holy Baptism the redeeming virtue of His sacrifice. The question inquires how this is, or in what sense this is to be taken.

The answer is, first, *that Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise.* Here the appointment is referred to Christ, as also in question 68. In question 66 it is referred to God. The English expression, *outward washing with water*, is not as strong as the original, Wasserbad; literally water-bath. Compare Titus

iii. 5—"Bath of regeneration." To this water-bath is joined the promise. The word *promise* is to be taken in the sense explained in a previous article.* Promise expresses not something future, but a present spiritual good. It refers to the word of God joined to the outward washing. "Therewith" relates to water-bath; not to the water, but to washing with water; not joined to the natural element, but to the transaction including the element. To this transaction is joined the word. So the Reformers expressed it, agreeably to the well-known formula of St. Augustine: "Verbum ad elementum accedit et sacramentum fit." The word comes to the transaction and thereby constitutes the Sacrament. Certainly this *word* is not sound or external utterance, but denotes the contents of the word: that which the promise holds in itself is joined mystically to the water-bath.

The remaining part of the answer expounds the meaning of the foregoing general proposition. This is explicit, while the former part is implicit—"I am washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ from the pollution of my soul." Notice the term "*I*." Not the body is washed, nor the soul, but *I* am washed. The word *I* is the deepest and most comprehensive form of expression for the mystery of personal existence. *I* am *washed* from the pollution of my soul. Pollution is correlate to washing—and is therefore explained by the subsequent clause, "from all my sins."

We will not anticipate what must be taken up in a subsequent answer, but simply say that the words, "from all my sins," mean deliverance from the twofold power of sin, or the twofold form in which the power of sin reigns over us. One form is guilt, the other is corruption or disorder. I am delivered from the penalty of my sin and from the corrupting power of sin. This deliverance is effected by the blood and Spirit of Christ. The term blood has direct reference to Christ offering Himself as a sacrifice on the cross by the shedding of His blood, or to the laying down of His life for us under the curse of the law, John x. 11, 18; and affirms the ground of salvation according to Question 67. The word Spirit refers to the Holy Ghost, and therefore to His regenerating work in us. These terms, *blood* and *Spirit*, express the twofold power of Baptism, remission of sins and the new birth, the negative and positive side of our salvation.

---

* See *Mercersburg Review,* vol. xix., p. 553., 1872.

The mystical washing is as real as the water-bath. The Catechism says: "As certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away." The answer distinguishes these two momenta: the water-bath and the mystical washing; or the outward ablution and the inward work wrought by grace in the life of the subject. But whilst the Catechism distinguishes it does not sunder these two things. It holds the one with the other. We may say the water-bath and the mystical washing go together. They prevail in one and the same moment of time. So much at least the Catechism warrants us in affirming. But we would rather say that they are one, sacramentally; for to say that the water-bath and the mystical washing go together means rather that the two run parallel; whereas the full truth, according to the New Testament, excludes such a parallelism, and involves a union of the natural and the supernatural. This union in its sphere corresponds to the union of the two natures in Christ. If the latter, the union of God with man in the person of Christ, be called internal and organic, then the former, the union of Christ by the Spirit with the natural element in the Sacrament, may also be called internal and mystical.

The Catechism does not only hold the one in conjunction with the other, but affirms the one to be as certain as the other. The inner washing from the pollution of sin by the blood of Christ is as certain as the outer bath, whereby the filthiness of the body is washed away. Were the inner work not wrought, there would be no warrant for the outward act. Thus the certainty belonging to the knowledge which we have through our senses attaches also to the knowledge of present grace which we have through faith. Neither one can be illusion or fancy.

The motive of the Catechism in using this form of expression is to convey to believers the strongest certitude, that by Baptism they are made partakers, truly, of the full benefit of the one all-sufficient sacrifice of Jesus Christ for all their sins; so that what they come to possess by grace is adequate to all their wants as sinners, and it is not necessary to supplement the work of Christ done for them by any additional works of their own.

We have six questions on Baptism. Of these the first gives us the general conception of the Sacrament; the remaining five unfold the import of this general conception, sustain it by arguments drawn from the Scriptures, defend it against misconstruction and false inference, and affirm its relation to the children of believers.

Question 70.—What is it to be washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ?

Answer.—It is to have the forgiveness of sins from God, through grace, for the sake of Christ's blood, which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross; and also, to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ, that so we may more and more die unto sin, and lead holy and unblamable lives.

The question takes up the leading expression in a previous answer: *washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ.* This language expresses the deepest meaning of Baptism. It supposes that the Sacrament possesses an interior and spiritual virtue. The Catechism affirms the interior efficacy figuratively by the use of the word "washing," because the language is ruled by the baptismal conception as given in the New Testament.

The answer resolves itself into two main parts: the first ending with the words "members of Christ." What follows is the second part. The first part teaches the nature of the washing by the blood and Spirit of Christ in relation, on the one side, to sin, and on the other, to the new life of grace. The second affirms the necessary connection between the sacramental washing and the personal history of the believer, or between Baptism and holy living, the latter being the purpose and end which the Sacrament is designed to subserve. These two main parts have each two subdivisions. We will take them up in regular order.

To be "washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ" is to have the forgiveness of sins from God through grace. Baptism seals to us the forgiveness of sins. To forgive is to remit the penalty of sin. But the penalty is not attached to sin externally by an act of the divine mind, so that the penalty might conceivably be taken away whilst the sin remains. Sin and penalty materially inhere in each other. The relation is internal. Penalty is of the nature of sin; just as felicity is of the nature of spiritual life. Sin and penalty accordingly do not simply accompany each other, much less do they follow the one upon the other. They are so essentially connected that sin is not conceivable without the present suffering of its penalty, and penalty is not conceivable without the present force of sin. There can therefore be no remission of the penalty but in as far as there is a taking away of sin itself. Hence the forgiveness of sin must include here the removal or the incipient destruction of that mysterious indwelling power which subjects us to the suffering of the penalty.

Forgiveness is predicated of God. God forgives sins; and this forgiveness from God is sealed to us by the Sacrament.

The words "through grace" pertain to the source or fountain whence forgiveness and salvation flow. Grace is the unfathomable love of God revealed in Christ, and, without any merit on our part, realized in us guilty sinners by the Holy Ghost. It is through such love of God to us that the inward cleansing from sin is freely imparted in Baptism.

Then comes the expression which is so common in the Catechism, "for the sake of Christ's blood which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross." It is not necessary here to enter upon an exposition of the language. Enough to say that the Catechism holds the redeeming work of Christ, as the ground of our salvation, to be all-sufficient; and in this redeeming work His sacrifice on the cross is a central act.

The forgiveness of sins, however, is only one side of the internal efficacy of Baptism. There is another side which is equally essential. Baptism makes the sinner a new man. Did the Sacrament not possess this supernatural virtue there could be no inward cleansing or real forgiveness.

The language of the Catechism is: "And also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost and sanctified to be members of Christ." The word "renewed" may be taken pathically. Then it means a new or changed frame of sentiment, another habit of mind. "Renewed" may be taken intellectually; it then means that there is produced in us a new and better knowledge of Christ, of God, and ourselves. "Renewed" may be taken ethically. It then means that the grace of Baptism generates in us a better will, a purer moral activity. "Renewed" may also be taken to include all these forms of meaning. But the renewing grace of Baptism, viewed under either one or all of these aspects together, would be only subjective. The manifestation of our life, as it obtains in feeling, thought and will, would be regarded as changed, the essence of our life meanwhile remaining the same.

The renewing efficacy of Baptism thus taken would be equivalent to repentance or conversion. But the Catechism does not hold that Baptism converts the subject, or of itself imparts to him a new spiritual experience; for it uniformly ascribes such experience to the exercise of true faith. The word must then, evidently, have another and a deeper meaning.

The word "renewed" in this connection has a different meaning. It is to be taken as affirming a new organic relation of the subject of Baptism with Christ, the Head of His mystical body. It means that we are made partakers of His life.

That this is the meaning of the Catechism is evident from the fact that the Catechism uses the term "renewed" in connection with the expression "sanctified to be members of Christ."

The subject of Baptism is both renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The Spirit renews him, and in renewing him, sanctifies him. The Spirit sanctifies him, but He sanctifies him in that He makes him really a new man. The new position which he occupies as renewed and sanctified by the Spirit, the Catechism expresses by the phrase: "members of Christ." The subject becomes by Baptism a member of Christ. The language is direct and positive. The Catechism does not intimate that to be members of Christ is an end to be reached by improving the grace of Baptism. The end of Baptism is brought out in the subsequent part of the answer. But it affirms that we are made members of Christ, in that we are renewed and sanctified; and this renewing and sanctifying work of the Spirit is the mystical washing of Holy Baptism.

The expression "members of Christ" must accordingly be construed, neither with *sanctified*, by itself, nor with *renewed*, but with both; for each word denotes but one aspect of the objective change wrought by the Spirit. Only when we hold both as essential and inseparable forms of one saving act in us, do we have the complete conception of the Catechism respecting the washing by the Spirit.

We may express the meaning in other words: The renewing and sanctifying of the Spirit constitutes us members of Christ. Before Baptism we were members of Adam, and subject to the curse entailed upon us by the fall. This is our position and character by nature. The Spirit takes us out of our natural position and translates us into a spiritual position. Spiritual, not in opposition to sense or understanding, but in opposition to the entire life of fallen humanity. The spiritual position is a position in Christ by the Spirit. It is new in contrast with our fallen life in Adam: and the real transition from the natural to the spiritual is a renewing, or a new birth.

The new position is holy in contrast with the sinfulness and corruption of our natural position in Adam: holy, not in a subjective but in an objective sense. We have not actualized the life of Christ perfectly in our actions, purposes, words, thoughts, feelings, and in the hidden tendencies of our personal existence.

Holiness thus apprehended comes gradually with the progress of the Christian as he grows in Christ, and cannot become complete before the resurrection from the dead. But the position is holy in that He into whom we have been engrafted by the Spirit is holy. Engrafted into Him, He is for us and in us the principle and power of holiness, and we become actually holy in the degree that we in turn live in Him by faith and obedience. Thus the real translation from our natural state in Adam to the spiritual state in Christ includes both the renewing and the sanctifying work of the Spirit. The renewing necessarily involves the sanctifying; and the sanctifying necessarily presupposes the renewing. Without either the change of relation would not be real.

It is evident then that we are not first renewed and sanctified by the Spirit in order that by faith we may become members of Christ; but we are made members of Christ in that we are renewed and sanctified; and being members of Him we are, by virtue of this organic relation, to develop a new and holy life.

These two things, forgiveness of sins and renewing by the Holy Ghost, are, according to the Catechism, included in the mystical washing of Baptism. They express the sense which is attached to the words of the question, "washed by the blood and Spirit of Christ." This mystical washing, that is, the forgiveness through the blood of Christ, and the renewing and sanctifying by the Holy Ghost to be members of Christ, is affirmed in the previous answer, to be as real and certain as the outward washing with water.

The forgiveness of sins and the renewing by the Holy Ghost, taken together, complete the idea of the grace of Baptism. In the statement, they follow each other and must be separated, but they are not separated in idea. In idea they are one. We are not first forgiven and then renewed by the Holy Ghost, neither are we not first renewed by the Holy Ghost and then forgiven. But the forgiveness and the renewing are two aspects of one divine act.

According to the Catechism, the twofold grace of the Spirit, as now explained, is *sealed* to us in Holy Baptism. The word sealed is to be taken in the Scripture sense, as in John vi. 27: "For Him hath God the Father sealed." Compare Eph. i. 13, and iv. 30. To seal, according to the New Testament, is not merely to impress on something already existing—an external sign of confirmation or ratification—but it is to constitute the relation of a person to God by the Spirit in a real way. God the Father sealed His Son at His baptism, when the heavens opened and the Spirit descended upon Him like a dove. The outward and sensible was only the manifestation of the inward and spiritual communication. The New Testament uses the word seal in no other sense.

According to the Scripture import of a sealing transaction, the Catechism asserts, as we have before seen, that the real communication of grace is as certain as the outward washing. That this may be so, the two things, the inward and the outward, must be simultaneous. When Holy Baptism is administered, then the Grace of the Blood and Spirit of Christ is communicated.

If this interpretation is not allowed to stand, then one of two alternatives must follow. The grace of Baptism must have been communicated at some time previous to the administration of the Sacrament. Going on this assumption, the grace of Baptism would not be certain; for forgiveness and the renewing by the Spirit would then depend, not on God, but on the subject. It would depend on repentance and faith; and if the repentance and faith were not genuine, the grace would not be conferred. Baptism would be a doubtful instead of a sealing ordinance.

Hence what the Catechism insists on so strenuously would fall to the ground. The grace on this assumption cannot be as certain as the baptismal act.

Let us assume the other alternative. The grace of Baptism is received *after* the baptismal act. The baptismal act is then no more than an outward pledge; and as in the previous case, the actual receiving of grace must depend on repentance and faith. If the subject, as is often the case, does not repent and believe, the grace sealed in Baptism is of no avail in any sense. The grace depends on a contingency, on something that may or may not take place, and most truly cannot be as certain as the baptismal act.

If, therefore, we are to accept the language of the Catechism in its full meaning, the least we must hold is that the grace is simultaneous with the baptismal transaction. Thus only can the inward be as certain as the outward. The language of the Catechism is explicit and unconditional. It does not say we are certainly washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ, if we repent and believe. Nothing of this kind appears in answer 69 or 70, or in the remaining answers on Baptism.

We pass on to the second main part of the answer, which expresses the end whereunto we are baptized, "that so we may more and more die unto sin and lead holy and unblamable lives." This part, like the first, has two elements; the one negative, the other positive.

The negative side is "that we may more and more die unto sin," corresponding to "forgiveness of sins from God for the sake of Christ's blood" as expressed in the first main part of the answer. The positive side is, that we "may lead holy and unblamable lives," corresponding to renewing and sanctifying by the Holy Ghost.

As our sins are forgiven, we are to die unto sin, "ye länger, ye mehr." We, as related to sin, die. Death is predicated of us, not of sin. We cease more and more to live under the power of sin, as our personal life is determined more and more by grace; and, in turn, sin itself becomes relatively a weaker force. In other words, the old man, as St. Paul names the fallen nature, is in process of destruction; on the other hand, the new man, as St. Paul calls the spiritual nature, is in process of development and growth; we lead a holy life. The holy life we lead is the fruit of regeneration, or of our engrafting into Christ by the Spirit, and involves repentance, faith and personal consecration to Christ.

These two, the dying of the old man and the continued vivification of the new man, are only different aspects of one mysterious process. They reciprocally condition each other. But the dying depends on the living. To live in Christ is the power in virtue of which we die unto sin. But the negative side of the process must go forward commensurably with its positive side. If not, the positive process is itself checked, if not suspended.

Holy Baptism is accordingly the beginning of a real salvation. We are forgiven, but this does not supersede the necessity of subsequent forgiveness. We are renewed and sanctified, but this does not supersede the necessity of free activity in the service of Christ. We may say properly that in Baptism we are saved. So St. Peter, "The like figure whereunto Baptism doth also now save us." (1 Peter, iii. 21.) But it is a salvation which looks toward a higher salvation and a completion in time to come.

As the subject of the second part of this answer is taken up in Ques. 88, 89 and 90, under the head of Repentance or Conversion, it is not necessary here to consider at length the doctrine of the Catechism. We will, however, emphasize one characteristic feature of the doctrine.

The conception of the *blood and Spirit of Christ* is of fundamental force. On the negative side, these three are connected together, viz.: Blood of Christ, forgiveness of sins from God, and dying unto sin, each one presupposing and depending on the other two, so that neither one can be understood in the sense of the Catechism unless it be viewed in relation to the others. As the sacrifice of Christ is in order to forgiveness, so is forgiveness in order to dying unto sin. If we receive no forgiveness, the sacrifice does not avail for our benefit, and if we do not die unto sin, the forgiveness received does not accomplish its purpose in our personal history. The relation of these three is to be viewed also under another aspect. No man can die unto sin unless he receives the grace of forgiveness from God; and there is no forgiveness possible unless it is grounded in the one all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ.

On the positive side there are also three connected together in a corresponding manner. These three are: The Spirit of Christ, renewing by His Spirit, and leading a holy life. The gift of Christ's Spirit is in order to our renewing by the Spirit, and our renewing by the Spirit is in order to a holy and unblamable life. Were the Spirit of Christ not given, and did He not abide in the Church, there could be no renewing by the Spirit; and were we not renewed and sanctified by the Spirit to be members of Christ, there could be no holy living. The third fact depends on the second, and the second on the first. No man can therefore lead a holy life unless he is a member of Christ; and no man can become a member of Christ except by the Spirit, who proceeds from Christ ascended and glorified.

The Catechism gives no countenance to the notion that any one can lead a life acceptable to God, who is not regenerated by the Holy Ghost. Nor does it countenance that other notion, which prevails among so many sects of the present day, that men are regenerated by the Spirit of *God*, that is, by the Spirit given at will by God directly from heaven. The Spirit that regenerates is the Spirit given by *Christ* glorified, now abiding and active in the communion and sacraments of the Church.

But there is another fact that requires special attention. The Catechism does not divide the Spirit from the blood of Christ, nor the blood from the Spirit of Christ. They are only two forms of one redeeming work. The virtue of the sacrifice becomes complete in the glorification of Christ, and the glorification of Christ in the coming of His Spirit. Were there no sacrifice possessing perpetual virtue in the communion of the Church, there would be no renewing of men by the Spirit, and in consequence no holy living. And were there no presence of the Spirit in undiminished fulness, there could be no forgiveness for the sake of Christ's blood, and no dying unto sin.

The Catechism affirms both sides of the truth, forgiveness and a new life, with equal distinctness and consistency; and affirms both in their connection with the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.

Question 71.—Where has Christ promised, that we are as certainly washed with His blood and Spirit, as with the water of Baptism?

Answer.—In the institution of Baptism, which runs thus: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

This promise is also repeated where the Scripture calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins.

The strong and explicit utterances respecting the efficacy of Baptism, as given in the previous answer, now lead the Catechism to inquire what warrant of authority there is in the word of Christ for such teaching. "Where has Christ promised?" is the question. We are referred directly not to the Old but to the New Testament; nor in a general way to the New Testament, but to what Christ Himself has taught. Christ has promised—what? He has promised two things: that we are washed by His blood and Spirit, and that we are as *certainly* washed by His blood and Spirit as we are with the water of Baptism. The aim of the Catechism is to maintain from the word of Christ that the inward washing, *i. e.*, the forgiveness of sins and the renewing by the Holy Ghost, is as real and certain as the outward washing.

The main part of the answer is drawn from the commission given by our Lord to His apostles, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark: Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15, 16. This is followed by two quotations from St. Paul—Titus iii. 5, and Acts xxii. 16.

From St. Matthew we have the words of institution: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" the latter part of the commission being omitted. From the commission as recorded by St. Mark we have: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here the first part is omitted.

Then follows the repetition of the promise as expressed by St. Paul: in the words "*washing of regeneration.*" The entire passage runs thus: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy, He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." From this passage the Catechism selects the most expressive clause—washing of regeneration; or, as the original may be translated, and as the German version has it, *bath of new birth.* "Das Bad der Wiedergeburt" is the descriptive title which St. Paul gives to Baptism; which is nearly equivalent to the phrase, sacrament of regeneration.

The equivalent expression, "*the washing away of sins,*" is taken from the address of St. Paul to the people in Jerusalem, in which he rehearses the history of his conversion to Christ. Ananias came unto him and said: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

The Catechism does not comment on the words of institution. They are so direct and unequivocal that they are cited without comment to support the idea of the nature and efficacy of Baptism, as taught in the preceding two questions. But the purpose for which the words of institution are quoted shows unmistakably in what sense they are taken; for they are quoted from the institution of Baptism to prove that our Lord has joined to the water-bath the forgiveness of sins, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; or, that Holy Baptism is an outward washing with water, and an inward washing by the blood and Spirit of Christ, at one and the same time. The meaning is seen in the words themselves; and is evident also from a consideration of the connection in which the words are made to stand by the Catechism.

The meaning appears, moreover, from the language which follows the words of institution. The Catechism says, "This promise is also repeated." The words of Christ are sufficient by themselves. The Catechism, of course, does not imply that they need any support or confirmation from St. Paul. But the design is to evince the harmony of apostolic teaching with that of Christ. Hence the writings of the Apostles are said to repeat what the words of institution teach. They repeat the same truth in other and equivalent forms of expression.

This answer confirms what we have said before in regard to the use of the word *promise*. In telling us what the promise is, and where it is to be found, the Catechism cites directly the institution of Baptism itself; and, in immediate connection therewith, the positive and unequivocal teaching of St. Paul. Hence by *promise* the Catechism cannot mean the grace of Christ disjoined from, and following after, Baptism; it cannot designate, merely, something that depends on what men may do, or may not do. Thus interpreted, the expression would contradict the central truth concerning Baptism, on which the entire argument of the Catechism hinges. But by *promise* the Catechism means the *word* of Christ indissolubly joined to the natural element. In virtue of this mystical conjunction of His word with the outward washing, the transaction becomes the bath of the new birth, or the washing away of sins.

Question 72.—Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?

Answer.—No: for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin.

The terms of the question are significant. The Catechism does not ask whether Baptism is itself the washing away of sins. This form of inquiry is studiously avoided; for *Baptism and external washing* with water (Wasserbad), are by no means equivalent expressions. In the Sacrament the Catechism recognizes two things as essential: the external water-bath and the internal grace. It inquires whether the outward washing, viewed by itself, possesses spiritual virtue; whether the application of the natural element can take away sin, implying that the internal and external washing may be confounded. The interior substance of Baptism may be ignored, and the supernatural virtue of the Sacrament ascribed exclusively to the external washing.

The occasion of the question is a supposed objection to the explicit teaching of the previous questions. The objector alleges: if, as you teach, the renewing and sanctifying by the Spirit, as well as the forgiveness of sins, are just as certain as the outward washing, then you ascribe spiritual efficacy to an external ablution. The answer is, "No!" We ascribe no spiritual efficacy to the external washing itself. "For only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin."

The objection in this form may come from the spiritualistic tendency which was ripe in the Reformation period. Many had no faith whatever in the objective virtue of the Sacraments.

The question, however, may also refer to another objection. The strong teaching of the Catechism exposed it, in the judgment of many, to the charge of teaching the Roman error, viz.: the so-called *opus operatum* theory. Then the objection would be—if the grace of the Spirit is just as certain as the water-bath, you supersede the necessity of repentance and faith, or of inward spiritual religion, and Baptism itself does the whole work irrespectively of the interior spiritual state and activity of the subject. To such a misapprehension and perversion of the doctrine of the Catechism, the answer likewise says "No." It negates two opposite errors; the one making Holy Baptism an empty sign, the other ascribing to it a force *ex opere operato.*

In the answer we meet the same language which we find in Answer 69, the favorite and most comprehensive language of the Catechism. The Catechism does not by any means hold the external water-bath to be a matter of indifference, but, when taken by itself, refuses to ascribe to it renewing and sanctifying efficacy, and ascribes such supernatural virtue solely and exclusively to the Blood and Spirit of Christ.

Nor does the Catechism mean to ascribe such efficacy to the blood and Spirit of Christ, as such, or abstractly considered. It does not imply that the sinner may receive saving grace and be made a member of Christ by the Spirit, with or without Baptism, as though Baptism were a matter of indifference; but it insists only on this: that when we emphasize the distinction between the visible sign and the invisible grace, the spiritual virtue of the Sacrament must be predicated of the invisible grace, not of the natural element.

Question 73.—Why, then, doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins?

Answer.—God speaks thus not without great cause; namely, not only to teach us thereby that, like as the filthiness of the body, is taken away by water, so our sins also are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ; but much more, that by this divine pledge and token, He may assure us that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water.

In the question the word *then* is emphatic. It refers to the doctrine of Baptism as presented in the entire preceding argument, but more particularly to question 72, which at first view seems to deny what was before so positively affirmed. If the outward washing, a transaction essential to the Sacrament, can not take away sins, why call the Sacrament the washing of regeneration? Are not the two things incompatible? The argument has apparently been involved in a dilemma. The contradiction must be removed.

But the seeming contradiction is not in the argument. It prevails rather in the misapprehension of the argument which underlies the alleged objection taken up in question 72. Observe that the objection adroitly changes the terms of the doctrine.

In the first three questions the Catechism speaks of the nature of Holy Baptism, which includes the washing with water and the washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ, both being essential constituents of the Sacrament. Question 72 changes the subject of inquiry. Instead of asking whether Baptism is indeed the washing away of sins, it asks whether the *outward washing*, an act of which, when taken by itself, the Catechism has predicated neither forgiveness nor regeneration, is such washing away of sins. It is to this one-sided and false conception of Baptism that the Catechism replies categorically in the negative. No such outward washing is of any avail; not because *Baptism* is inefficacious, but because the outward washing with water is *not* Baptism.

In question 73 we are led back to the consideration of the subject proper; not to the contemplation of the external water-bath, but to that of Holy Baptism itself. "Why then doth the Holy Ghost call *Baptism* the washing of regeneration?" If such language is so liable to misapprehension; if we are in danger of ascribing a virtue to water that can be predicated only of the blood and Spirit of Christ, why speak of the *washing* of regeneration?

The answer proceeds to justify both the general doctrine and the language by which the doctrine is expressed. "God speaks thus not without great cause." There is a sufficient reason for the affirmation that Baptism is the washing of regeneration. What is it?

The reason is twofold; and the answer, in consequence, resolves itself into two members, the one being the protasis, and the other the apodosis at one general proposition. The protasis, or first member of the proposition, is negative, but involves a direct affirmation. The apodosis, or second member, is affirmative, but involves a direct negation of the previous implied affirmation as containing the whole idea of the Sacrament. Let us consider the two members in proper order.

The first member denies. What does it deny? The Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, "not only to teach us thereby that like as the filthiness of the body is taken away by water, so our sins also are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ." This language involves the affirmation that there is an analogy between the washing of the body with water, which removes outward filthiness, and the inward washing by the blood and Spirit of Christ, which removes the pollution of our sins. The outward and natural is a figure or sign of the inward and spiritual; and thus aids us in apprehending the meaning and force of Baptism. We see the communication and efficacy of grace in the application and cleansing of water. The language of the answer implies also that Baptism is called the washing of regeneration for the purpose of *teaching* us that there is this analogy between the outward washing with water and the inward washing by the Spirit. Water is a symbol, and Baptism involves a symbolical transaction. The words "*not only* to teach us thereby," followed in the second member by the adversative formula: "but much more," clearly involves the idea that the Sacrament has symbolical significance. God teaches us by the Sacrament that our sins are taken away just as the filthiness of the body is taken away.

But the implicit affirmation is involved in a categorical negation. The negation is the prominent and ruling thought. Whilst the protasis means to imply that there is undoubtedly such an analogy between the application of water and the purification by the Spirit, the leading purpose is to *deny* that when the Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, He teaches us this *only*, and no more. It is denied that Baptism is merely a symbol; or that the conception of an analogy between water and the Spirit takes up the true nature of the Sacrament. The denial proceeds on the assumption that the Sacrament is much more than a teaching symbol. It possesses a character, an interior power, which transcends the simple conception of an analogy between outward washing and inward purification; and thus postulates the necessity of progress in the argument; in other words, the necessity of the direct affirmation which follows in the second member of the answer.

The Catechism accordingly sets aside the view of all those who accord to Baptism the force of a symbol only, and maintain that the Sacrament does no more than teach, by means of an impressive ceremony, that our sins are removed by divine grace. Did the Catechism design to affirm this truth, and nothing more, the affirmation involved in the protasis would itself express it, and there would be no occasion on the one hand to deny that the implicit affirmation exhausts the idea of Baptism, and on the other to pass on and assert positively that the idea includes "much more."

Let us now consider the second member of the answer. As stated before, the apodosis contains a direct affirmation, which involves a relative denial of the truth affirmed by implication in the protasis. The adversative formula, "but much more," plainly implies that whilst Baptism, as being the washing of regeneration, is a symbolical transaction, yet the conception of a symbol does not comprehend the peculiar nature of the Sacrament in distinction from teaching by word or symbol. The Sacrament is far more than either one or both. It does *not only* teach us, but it does much more than teach or symbolize. What is the *much more?* What is the reason that the Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration? What is the true and positive reason?

The *much more*, as the answer has it, is "that by this divine pledge and token He may assure us, that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water." The force of the positive assertion turns on the word *assure*, and is used antithetically to the word *teach* in the protasis. God does not only teach us; but much more than this, by calling Baptism the washing of regeneration, He also assures. The original is *willversichern.* God designs to remove all doubt or fear, and cause us to believe certainly and firmly that the invisible grace which the sacramental transaction symbolizes is not absent or wanting, but is a present fact. The answer, however, does not get beyond the conception of assurance. The visible and the invisible, the outward and the inward, are put and held in juxtaposition; and the reality of the one certifies the presence of the other; but the two things, the supernatural and the natural, are not so related as to constitute one mystery.

Of what does God assure us? That we are really washed from our sins spiritually. The argument is approaching a climax; at least it aims at this. The answer to question 69 says that "I am washed from all my sins as *certainly* as I am washed with water." The German is, *so gewiss.* Question 71 continues the same formula: "Where has Christ promised that we are as certainly (*so gewiss*) washed?" But here the Catechism relinquishes this formula, and adopts another. It rises from the conception of *gewissheit* (certainty) to that of *wahrhaftigkeit* (reality). The spiritual washing is not merely *certain* but *real*, not *gewiss*, but *wahrhaftig.* The German *wahrhaftig* is much stronger than the English word really or truly. It means not only that the spiritual washing is a present transaction, but that it is as true and actual as the bodily washing. We are as really washed from our sins spiritually, that is, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, as our bodies are washed with water.

The English language does not allow a literal rendering of the German; and thus weakens somewhat the force of the argument. The English, in giving the analogy or parallel between the spiritual washing and the bodily washing, changes the subject. It says, "*We* are as really washed from our sins as *our bodies* are washed." But the German has the same subject in both relations. *We* are washed from our sins, and *we* are washed with water. As we are the subjects of a bodily washing, so really are we at the same time the subjects of a spiritual washing. Both are equally a present fact.

How does God assure us that we are really washed spiritually? He does it "by this divine pledge and token." A *pledge* is something that stands good for that which it represents. The two, the pledge and the thing pledged, stand together, and fall together. The one cannot prevail without the other. The relation is in this sense unconditional; but not internal and vital.

A *token* is of the nature of sign; but a stronger term; yet token is not as strong a term as the German *wahrzeichen*, truth sign; that is, a visible object that is so connected with the invisible truth which it exhibits, that the former becomes the positive guaranty of the latter.

Pledge and token are conjoined. They do not express different conceptions, but two aspects of one common conception. They are conjoined in order to affirm the present grace of Baptism with more clearness and force; or, expressing the same thing in other words, Baptism symbolizes grace and makes certain to the subject the presence and virtue of grace.

The pledge and token are divine. The adjective qualifies both. The pledge is divine: the token is divine. Or rather that one act, designated as a pledge and token, is divine. Divine, first, because the washing with water in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost is instituted by Christ; and second, because there is connected with the outward washing a divine act. Holy Baptism is a divine transaction. The pledge and token given by God must be true. His word being joined to the outward washing, and God being true to His word, we have a transaction wherein the spiritual washing cannot but be as certain and real as the bodily washing.

Question 74.—Are infants also to be baptized?

Answer.—Yes. For since they, as well as their parents, belong to the covenant and people of God, and both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them, no less than to their parents, they are also by Baptism, as a sign of the covenant, to be ingrafted into the Christian Church, and distinguished from the children of unbelievers, as was done in the Old Testament by circumcision, in the place of which in the New Testament Baptism is appointed.

To this question the Catechism replies unequivocally "Yes." Although infants for want of adequate maturity of life are incapable of repentance for sin and faith in Christ, yet they are to be baptized. The grace of Baptism may not be denied to them. This unequivocal answer affirms the catholic position of the Reformed Church relative to infant baptism; and in one view of the case it is entirely sufficient. But for the reason already given the answer proceeds to state more fully the sense in which the positive affirmation is made and the ground on which it rests. We have, therefore, in what follows, two leading thoughts. The one pertains to the nature and force of infant baptism, the other to the argument by which the practice of the Church is sustained and defended against the attacks of all classes of anti-pedobaptists.

The main thought comes out in the middle portion of the answer—" They are also by Baptism to be engrafted into the Christian Church;" and the force of the thought turns on the word *engrafted.* The original is *einverleibt*, literally *incorporated;* that is, made a member of the mystical body. But the Anglo-saxon term *engraft* suits the context better. By Baptism there is established a new life relation of the infant with Christ in His Church. So St. Paul: " Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection." (Rom. vi. 4, 5.)

The figure of engrafting is borrowed from the language of St. Paul, and is derived from a natural act. (Romans xi. 17-23.) A twig cut off from one tree is set into the body of another tree, and the two by a reciprocal life-action become one constitution. The twig grows as a member of the organism of the tree. It grows by virtue of the internal plastic power of the living, growing tree; but not by this plastic power exclusively. The living twig reacts upon the life of the tree, taking that life up into itself, and transfusing through itself all the mysterious energies of the tree. Then the twig grows as the tree grows. The tree grows in the twig, and the twig in the tree.

In the light of this rich analogy the Catechism affirms the nature and objective force of infant baptism. The infant is engrafted, or made a member of Christ's mystical body. It is translated from the kingdom and power of the devil into the kingdom and power of Christ, and then stands in the supernatural communion of Christ, where it possesses all the spiritual resources that are requisite to growth in grace. If it is rightly trained by the parents; and if, as it develops into consciousness and freedom, it does not renounce its spiritual inheritance, but avails itself of the resources of grace which it possesses, the new life relation will issue in complete salvation and eternal blessedness.

The Catechism says that the infant is engrafted *by Baptism*. Baptism on the one hand is the sacrament that breaks the power of the fall and the curse, or the power of the old natural relation in which the child stands by natural birth. On the other, it is the Sacrament that constitutes the new relation of life and salvation on the spirit, or that makes the child a partaker of the infinite fullness of Christ.

The engrafting is effected by Baptism "as a sign of the covenant." The covenant is the real economy or household of grace, or the supernatural communion on earth, created, ruled, and perpetuated by the Holy Spirit of Christ given on the day of Pentecost. Baptism, the washing of regeneration, being both an outward and an inward act, is a sign and seal of the supernatural communion, symbolizing the positive efficacy of the grace conferred, this grace by which the unconscious subject is adopted into the family of God. (Ques. 65.)

The argument by which the baptismal engrafting of infant children into the Christian Church is supported and defended is twofold. The one is, that the children of the faithful "belong to the covenant and people of God;" the other, that "both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them."

Infants belong to the covenant and people of God; the one term, covenant, designating the new objective order of life, in the bosom of which alone the salvation of Christ prevails, and is accessible to sinners, whether adults or infants ; the other, people of God, designating the community of individual members, of which the covenant or supernatural economy is composed. Infants belong to both. The word belong, *gehœren*, may, however, not be pressed, or there would be a contradiction between the antecedent assigning the reason and necessity of Baptism, and the consequent affirming the force and benefit thereof.

Belong does not mean that infants as such are in the proper sense members of the covenant. Were this the case, then grace would be communicated according to the law of natural generation. Natural birth from Christian parents would, *ipso facto*, constitute the child a member of the supernatural economy. The idea involves a confusion of the order of nature and the order of grace, or of the natural and the spiritual. According to the law of nature the fallen life of mankind reproduces and perpetuates itself in the image of the first man. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. Only that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. (John iii. 6.) If we assume that the Spirit of Christ works in and with the law of natural generation, then we are afloat upon the pantheistic current of thought, and surrender the broad, clearly defined scriptural distinction between the economy of nature and the economy of the Spirit.

But the term *belong* is to be understood in the sense of right or title. The natural relation of an infant to its believing, Christian parents, secures for it the right to a spiritual relation, or the right to a participation in the spiritual blessings which its parents, as the people of God, possess. The relation implies, on the part of the parents, obligation, and on the part of the child, a positive claim or title. The parents are bound to consecrate their child by Baptism to Christ, and thus bring it into the spiritual communion of the Church ; and the infant, just as it has rights before the civil law, though unconscious, has a silent claim also, equally real and positive, though unable to assert the right itself, before the spiritual law, or at the altar of God, which the parents and the minister of Christ can as little disregard or violate as they can the positive right of the infant to food and clothing. It has spiritual and churchly rights as really as it possesses natural or bodily rights.

The fact that the child of believing parents possesses such spiritual rights according to the law of the Christian faith is the first reason assigned by the Catechism for the Baptism of infants. The reason rests on an organic view of the human race. As in the natural order the child is bound up necessarily with the parents, so that it shares their blood, nationality, language, civil position and honors, the blessings of their morality and social culture, as well as the miseries of their vice and degradation, so also is it bound up with them in the spiritual order.

Through the divinely appointed means of grace not the isolated individual only, but the family, is to be made a sharer in full of the gifts of the Spirit. To maintain that the infant is excluded, because unable to repent and believe, involves a contradiction. It is on the one hand to affirm that Christianity is adapted to the nature and all the wants of the human race, and on the other, to set aside and contravene the deepest law that informs and governs the organization of human society.

The other reason assigned for the baptism of infants is still stronger and more direct. It grows immediately out of the nature and design of the Christian salvation. "Redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost are promised to them." The Catechism recognizes in the infant the presence and power of sin, according to questions 7 and 8. Being organically one with the fallen race, it is under the curse from the moment of conception. "Conceived and born in sin," it is helplessly and hopelessly subject to corruption and death. Hence for the infant, redemption or actual deliverance from the kingdom of darkness, is as necessary as for the parents: and the redemption of Christ, being designed for mankind, not for single individuals, this redemption is promised to every rank and class of mankind; infants being as really comprehended as adults. The promise is indeed expressed in the written word, but it has a deeper ground. It lies in the very idea of the salvation of

Christ. The written word only utters and records the comprehensive truth which the salvation, as holding in the person and work of Christ, embraces.

The language of the Catechism, "redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost," is not here to be taken objectively. It does not mean merely, as some Calvinists maintain, that the value of the atonement is infinite, and therefore is in itself sufficient for all men, or that the merit of Christ's active and passive obedience is sufficient to cover the demerit of all possible sins; whilst the design and availability of the infinite merit of Christ does not, with equal certainty, relate to every individual member of the race. That the Catechism really holds the infinite value of Christ's redeeming work, and that no one will perish for want of an adequate salvation, objectively considered, is undoubted. But this view of redemption is not, taken by itself, the reason which the Catechism assigns for the baptism of infants.

The language is to be taken rather in a subjective sense. It means that the infinite value of the salvation wrought out by Christ is really a salvation for the infant no less than for its parents. The infant is to be made positively a partaker of redemption and the Holy Ghost. Grace is *promised* to it. It is the subject for whom Christ died and rose again, and to whom the Holy Ghost is to be given; the infant, though incapable of any free activity, being yet capable of receiving the Spirit, and of sharing the benefits of redemption, which the Spirit applies. Accordingly, in the sermon of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, the first evangelical sermon preached in the power of the Spirit, the relation of the completed salvation to the children of believers is unequivocally proclaimed. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 38, 39.)

The baptismal gift of the Spirit works faith in the heart of the baptized child. Apprehended by the Spirit in Baptism, and adopted into the communion of the Spirit, the infant is subject to the transforming and moulding power of the Spirit, who so works in the germinal beginnings of awakening personal existence, that the child is constrained to believe and rejoice in Jesus Christ, so soon as, developing gradually into consciousness, it gets a sense and a perception of Him.

The promise of redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost is referred "to the blood of Christ," or to the offering of Himself on the cross, which Christ, now glorified at the right hand of God, made when in the flesh. "He bore, in body and soul, the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race, in order that by His passion, as the only atoning sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the grace of God, righteousness and eternal life." (Ques. 37.) The guilt for which He thus atoned is not merely the guilt which the race incurs by actual transgression. He atones for the universal guilt attaching to the race in consequence of the fall. "He is our mediator, and with His innocence and perfect holiness covers, in the sight of God, my sin wherein I was conceived." (Ques. 36.) The blood of Christ, being shed as truly for inborn sin as for actual transgression, whereby inborn sin is covered before God as certainly as actual sin is pardoned, the promise realized by the child in Baptism is, according to the Catechism, the direct and necessary effect of redemption as really as the personal justification of the adult sinner through faith.

The Catechism does not hold the doctrine of a limited atonement, as taught by the Decrees of the Synod of Dort and the Confession of the Westminster Assembly. Christ is the Saviour of mankind, not of some elect individuals only. As He has assumed the nature of Adam, which all men possess, so He has atoned for the sin of Adam, in which all men, by the common possession of a fallen nature, are involved. Such being the extent of the atonement affirmed by the Catechism, it can give no countenance to the notion of a supralapsarian decree, according to which some infants are from all eternity elected unto life eternal, agreeably to the sovereign pleasure of Almighty God, whilst others are passed by, being given over absolutely as vessels of wrath to the power of the devil. For non-elect infants there is no Saviour, no atonement, no saving work of the Holy Ghost, and therefore no grace in holy baptism. They are lost irrecoverably, whether baptized or not baptized. Redemption not being promised to them, the sacrament of Baptism cannot make them partakers of redemption. Baptism can avail only for the spiritual benefit of the elect. Of such limitations of sacramental grace by the divine counsel, the Catechism knows nothing. It does not discriminate. All baptized infants are the subject of the promise; and all are thereby, in virtue of the redeeming work of Christ, made partakers of the Holy Spirit, who works faith in their hearts, so that, believing in Christ and abiding in faith, they may, one and all, be eternally saved.

Observe that the Catechism continues the distinction between the *blood* and *Spirit* of Christ which runs through the previous questions and answers on Holy Baptism; intending to teach thereby that the full benefit of Christ, the negative and positive efficacy of His work, on the forgiveness of sins and the mystical union with Christ, is for infants no less than for adults. For this reason we have the clear, positive affirmation that infants are by Baptism *engrafted* into the Christian Church.

Thus engrafted, the children of believing parents are "distinguished from the children of unbelievers." The distinction is inward and real as well as outward and nominal. The children of unbelievers do not as such possess the blessings of the Faith. They are not only not in the covenant; they do not only not possess the grace which prevails in the communion of the Church; but they do not, like the children of believers, "belong to the covenant and people of God;" that is, they do not, in virtue of their natural relation to their parents, possess any right or title to an engrafting by Baptism into the Christian Church. They stand in the old stock as in the wild olive tree; and as such being members exclusively of fallen humanity are, like their parents, the children of wrath. But the broad distinction made between these two classes of infant children does not contradict the objective character and design of the Gospel, which, considered in itself, is adapted to the needs of all alike and designed for all. The distinction only emphasizes the positive spiritual advantages of the children of the Church over the children of the world, and by necessary implication condemns as sinful the indifference of parents to the means of grace. How fearful is the responsibility of those who through their unbelief not only close the door of hope against themselves, but, so far as their unbelief and negligence work their effect in the spiritual history of their families and of their posterity, also shut them out from the kingdom of heaven.

These, then, are the principal reasons of the Catechism for the baptism of infants. The children of believers are entitled to the blessings of the covenant, and the grace of the Gospel is promised to them in distinction from the children of unbelievers. They are therefore by Baptism to be constituted members of the mystical body of Christ.

In conclusion, the answer proceeds to draw a parallel between the Old and New Testament, between circumcision and the sacrament of Baptism, between the children of Jewish and the children of Christian parents; a parallel that serves both to illustrate and to support infant Baptism by a subordinate argument. The Mosaic economy foreshadows the Christian economy. Whilst it was limited to the Jewish nation it nevertheless comprehended every member of the Jewish family, being intended for the helpless infant as well as for the full-grown man. The Christian economy is not less comprehensive. Designed not for a single nation, but for all the nations of the earth, it as a matter of course includes the child. The substance does not contradict the shadow. The fulfillment of the promise in Christ cannot contravene the economy of the promise. Otherwise the Christian Church would not be the fulfillment of Judaism, but a contradiction.

Rights and duties under the Christian economy are analogous to rights and duties under the Jewish economy. What was then the duty of Jewish parents is now the duty of Christian parents. What were then the rights of Jewish children, are now the rights of Christian children. As the neglect of circumcision held the child in the state of nature and excluded it from the blessing of God bestowed in and through the Jewish communion, so does the neglect of Baptism keep the child in its original natural state, subject to the powers of the Kingdom of Darkness, and exclude it from a positive participation in the Grace of the Gospel, which is accessible nowhere but in the communion of the Christian Church.

CONCLUSION.

The results of our examination of these six questions and answers we gather up in the following propositions, which express in summary form a correct view, as we believe, of the doctrine of Holy Baptism as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism.

1. Holy Baptism is an ordinance wherein by the appointment of Christ the outward washing with water and the inward washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ are conjoined in one transaction, and so conjoined that the inward washing is always as certain and real as the outward washing.

2. The spiritual benefit conferred by Baptism upon the person baptized is the washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ. This grace is accordingly twofold, namely, the forgiveness of sins for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ offered for us on the cross, and renewal by the Holy Ghost; or remission of sin and the new birth.

Thus through Baptism they who worthily receive this Sacrament are separated from the unbelieving world, renewed and sanctified to be members of Christ, and engrafted into His mystical body. These several forms of spiritual blessing however, separation, forgiveness, renewal and engrafting are not divine gifts which are conferred one after another, but they are different aspects only of one act of the free grace of God.

3. The spiritual efficacy of Baptism is objective; being neither in the officiating minister nor in the person baptized, but in the ordinance itself duly administered and received. No

personal unfitness of the subject, nor moral unworthiness, can affect the nature of the Sacrament, or detract from the reality and virtue of the baptismal transaction.

4. But when the Catechism distinguishes between the external washing with water and the internal washing with the Holy Spirit, the spiritual efficacy of Baptism is ascribed, not to the external washing itself, for the external washing considered by itself is not the sacramental transaction, but to the blood and Spirit of Christ. Spiritual efficacy, however, is not ascribed to the blood and Spirit of Christ as such, or as abstracted from the external washing with water, but to His blood and Spirit as sacramentally connected with the external washing with water in the baptismal transaction.

5. The spiritual efficacy of Baptism is not tied to the moment of administration.

This proposition does not mean that the baptismal transaction may be an empty or purely external washing, the internal washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ being not sacramentally connected therewith.

But the proposition means that the cleansing and renewing efficacy of Baptism is not limited by the moment of time when the Sacrament is administered.

The grace conferred at the time of administration is efficacious retrospectively and prospectively; being effectual for the taking away of the sins of the subject that have been committed in time past or that may be committed in time to come.

6. The grace conferred by Baptism is efficacious retrospectively. The person baptized being through the medium of the Sacrament introduced into the covenant and engrafted into Christ, and thus joined to Him in His death and resurrection, receives the forgiveness of inborn and actual sins. The dominion of the kingdom of darkness is broken, and the guilt of his transgressions is taken away. He passes from the sphere of the curse and of death into the sphere of grace and of life.

7. The grace conferred by Baptism is efficacious prospectively. The efficacy of the Sacrament extends to sins that may be committed after it has been administered; and this efficacy

is as certain and complete in its relation to the future as it is in its relation to the present and the past.

As natural birth has force and effect for the whole period of natural life even unto death, the filial relation never being annihilated, so has the new birth, or the washing of regeneration, full force and effect for the entire subsequent, ethical and religious history of the subject, the virtue of the new spiritual relation being at no time absolutely abolished. The penitent prodigal, be he never so guilty, may ever recur by faith to the real relation wherein he stands as a child of God by adoption in Christ; that is to say, he may recur to his Baptism as the seal of God's saving grace, and the pledge of forgiveness which, for the infinite merits of Christ, God is willing freely to grant.

8. Although efficacious as the seal of forgiveness and of the new life both retrospectively and prospectively, yet Baptism does not save the subject *ex opere operato.* The blood and Spirit of Christ work no spiritual effect in the personal life and personal history of the subject mechanically or magically. The personal experience of forgiveness and the actual development of the objective spiritual relation involves the necessity of repentance and faith on the part of the subject.

The objective efficacious grace of Baptism must be met by a corresponding subjective appropriation of that grace, in order that the subject may actually die unto sin and lead a holy and unblamable life.

The whole truth is expressed in a twofold proposition. Whilst on the one hand we must say: no Baptism, no objective engrafting into the mystical body of Christ; on the other hand we must assert with equal decision: no personal faith, no experience of the forgiveness of sins and no actualized salvation.

Or we may express the truth thus: no Baptism, no adoption; no faith, no salvation.

The principle: no faith, no salvation, is not applicable, using the term *faith* in the ordinary sense, to baptized infants dying in infancy. They are saved in virtue of the gracious relation which they sustain to Christ by Baptism.

9. Baptism is the act of God whereby He adopts the subject

into the sphere of grace, thus giving him a new position, a new objective relation, and the rights of a child. Faith is the act of man, the act of the subject of Baptism, whereby he recognizes and acknowledges his new position and relation, and appropriates to himself the free grace of God by which he has been apprehended. Without the first, faith has no proper warrant, no real relation to validate and justify it. Belief becomes an imagination. Without the second, divine grace is only a latent possibility. The new position into which he has been translated does not and cannot become a transforming power in the heart of the subject, inspiring and governing his will and the whole sphere of his ethical and religious life. The old man is not mortified. The new man is not quickened.

10. The infant children of believing parents are to be baptized.

(1.) Because they need the benefits of Baptism. They need the forgiveness of sin and the new life of the Spirit.

(2.) Because they possess a right to these benefits of thecovenant of grace in that they are the children of believing parents.

(3.) Because these benefits are promised to them as infants; and divine grace is able to apprehend them, although they are incapable of the conscious responsive activity of faith.

11. Infants are by Baptism engrafted into the Christian Church; and thus a real distinction is constituted between them and the children of unbelievers.

12. The Baptism of infants in the New Testament is analogous to circumcision in the Old. Baptism works an effect for them relatively to Christ and the Christian economy as real and great as the effect which circumcision wrought for the children of the Jews relatively to the Mosaic economy.

These theses are warranted, we think, by the sacramental theory in general and the doctrine of Baptism in particular as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, and are sustained throughout by all the other confessions of the Reformed Church.

Art. V.—DALTON ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.*

By Rev. F. K. Levan, A. M.

We have here a truly able, interesting and valuable book. Some guarantee for all this we have already in the well established character of its author, who stands high among German-speaking Christians, as a wise worker and a practical writer, whose welcome has been secured in thousands of homes. Rev. Hermann Dalton is pastor of the large and influential Reformed congregation in St. Petersburg, Russia, consisting of German immigrants and descendants of such, of whom there are many in the Muscovite capital. His popularity has gone beyond the people of his own nationality, and found a response among Russians themselves. When building his large new church a few years ago—unfortunately burnt down just after completion, and now happily rebuilding—even the Czar made liberal and marked contributions.

The ability of the book, we think, lies particularly in the wide field of theology which it covers and handles with the ease of a familiar subject, and in the clearness with which it apprehends the Reformed stand-point as growing out of the general movement of the Reformation, and the manifest sense of the Heidelberg Catechism as viewed in this light. Regarding style it leaves little to be wished for. Doctrines, facts and duties are made to stand in organic harmony and address you with a native winning air, of which much of our theological literature so sadly deprives them. Yet practical everywhere. Recondite wisdom in popular form. Weighty observations taken right out of the real world, richest fruit, and fresh as when first plucked. A friend of ours lately said that he tried to read Bethune's Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism—very respectable in style and contents, by the way—and found it a task, more than enough. We fear no such remark from an equally capable source with respect to Dalton's work. Racy as a romance, limpidly flowing as the liquid fountain, warmly in sympathy with the universal truth, it breathes throughout the spirit of earnest devotion and loving faith. The author calls his book "Confessional and Devotional." That he has in the main made good his claim for it, constitutes probably its greatest merit, especially for our times. The spirit of our age seems to have unfitted writers, otherwise possessed of ability, for allowing their normal harmony to these twin elements of the Christian life. Confessional authors, as a rule, neither represent nor awaken devotion; while devotional authors very commonly feel constrained to keep at the farthest remove from confessionalism in every form. A practical dualism between them runs through our later literature. Nor will an outward placing them side by side meet the case. There is an inner, normal harmony between them, and the seeing and representing that—naught else—will legitimate itself to the Christian consciousness. Pastor Dalton considers the Heidelberg Catechism as pre-eminently both a Confession and a book of Devotion. The underlying thought holds that as a Confession it is *representative* of all the other Reformed confessions, *general* when they betimes become particular, *inclusive* where perchance the one or the other of them was pressed to become exclusive. This broad basis shuts out no truth of universal force, no single fact or duty which ought to be common to the Christian Church in its most catholic character. It allows and seeks them all. And down on this real bottom—neither imaginary nor arbitrary—of the universal Christian order and system room is found for the true devotional element. It is at home here, and will never be wanting here, where in a most vital sense

---

* *Immanuel.* Der Heidelberger Katechismus als Bekenntniss- und Erbauungsbuch der evangelischen Gemeinde erklärt und an's Herz gelegt von *Hermann Dalton.* pp. 539. Wiesbaden, 1870.

"The saints of all ages in harmony meet."

Having such general character we should like to see a wide circulation to this work. Among other things it would do this double good. To members of the Reformed communion it would help to make clear what a rich inheritance they have in their Catechism and in their absolute kinship, through it, as their confession, in definite form with the history and treasures of Christianity in every age. No one can tell of what moulding account this fact may be in the present upheaved and restless condition of nominal Christendom, if only those who are specially called to its defence will comprehend their position, stand firm in their ranks, and do manful duty under the great Captain of their salvation. Members of other communions would learn more of us than they now know, as a rule; their minds would be freed of misapprehensions, and a more just sense of our relation to the general family of Christians would find place with them.

We propose to let pastor Dalton's book speak mainly for itself, and regret only that our limited space compels the giving of such *disjecta membra*, and these withal culled from but a few of the many rich chapters with which the work abounds. We begin with broken remarks of his on Question XXII. of the Catechism.

"With true faith goes the hearty confidence that *I* have become a partaker of its contents. I must believe in order to know what true faith means, just as I must see to understand light, or live to appreciate life. This truth the Catechism emphasizes with unyielding firmness, and presses home with affectionate interest, and thus secures his just right to each individual person. But with equal positiveness and earnestness on the other hand, it lays stress upon the unalterable contents of faith. They are not matter of opinion which I may believe or not. I neither make nor shape the object of faith; it is God's own doing, the result of His will, which I may only believingly appropriate to myself. Hence the Catechism does not ask what is necessary for thee to believe, but in general: What is necessary for a Christian to believe? What are the contents, by the believing acceptance of which, he, who once was a sinner, knows himself saved through grace." Page 123.

Here we have a distinct statement of the *certitude of faith*, the blessed privilege of each believer, which the Holy Ghost works in his heart, as the Catechism elsewhere expresses it; and at the same time the representation of its sacred contents as of God, and not subject to any change on the part of the human mind or will. After a short sketch of the history and character of the Apostles' Creed as embodying the contents of the Christian faith, our author says:

"So then, the Apostles' Creed is for us the sum of the Gospel. Its several articles stand there in noble simplicity and brevity. Not to prove, they seek only to confess that which the believer has experienced as truth. They do it manfully, fearlessly, freely. Every self-conceit, every private opinion is stripped off these brief words: they are the words of the Apostles. With grand force and decision, in full consciousness of that with which it deals, all side-matters are avoided: only the main facts of the blessed divine mystery are simply set forth. Touch them whosoever listeth. Their forcible, terse style leaves room neither for modification nor doubtful interpretation.

These articles are the common possession of the entire Christian Church, which permits no doubt concerning them. As such treasure in common the Creed is alike dear to us and revered by us. Highly do we honor in it the bond of the faith in the promised *one shepherd and one flock*. May never so many distinctions appear in the further development of the several churches this confession testifies, over and over again, that notwithstanding all divisions, there remains in it the one thing belonging to all, teaching that we are brethren, and may reach forth to each other in spirit, over and above the lines of separation, the fraternal hand of fellowship." Page 127.

From the discussion of the difficult article of the descent into hades we quote the following, taking the liberty simply to direct special attention to the third paragraph as ruling out completely every narrow interpretation of the Catechism's conception of this article.

"Gradually and with slow growth the different articles were taken up into the Apostles' Creed. Not all fruits ripen equally fast. One point and then another of the Apostolic message struck so directly into the consciousness of the listening church and enkindled faith and hearty consent in such manner that it answered with its Amen, and placed the fact as an added link into the golden chain of its confession. Other points found it less easy to prove their right to admission. A careful test awaited them. The passing zeal of a single congregation was insufficient: the consent of the whole Church, continued through generations, had to be obtained. The longest test fell to the lot of our article concerning the *descent into Hades.* It is the youngest member of the Creed, and had to pass through many trials, ere it won its place of honor and received universal assent.

"Not even yet is there yielded to it the same warm favor and the like hearty trust as to the other articles of the Confession. There remains a certain fear with respect to it, the uncomfortable sense of confronting a doctrine of whose mysterious contents, drawn from the very depths of the divine Word, one has indeed some apprehension but not that clearness of conception needful to a joyous confession. This joy becomes the more difficult for us Germans on account of the ambiguity of expression. While we use the word "hell" almost exclusively to designate the place of the lost, it is here the translation of a word which means the realm of the departed in general, irrespective of the distinction between the saved and the lost.

"Our Church, and especially our Catechism, has taken a position of fullest freedom with respect to this article. The latter has asserted the right to lay stress particularly upon that side of it in which it can believe. As faith is for it a hearty trust, it will not bring it down to the level of a mere doctrinal opinion. Our Church, however, likewise allows the privilege of honoring other points connected with this article, and several of our Confessions have gone further into the sense of this difficult, rich article, and so have enabled other sides thereof to come to their equally well-founded rights." Pp. 209, 210.

We all know how the ambiguity of the word "hell," above referred to, holds with equal force in English. And this mere accident, having nothing whatever to do with the sense of the article, has no doubt been a serious bar to the hearty use of the Creed in the public services of American Churches, as well as a drawback to its cheerful reception as a whole by large portions of English-speaking people. It is matter for congratulation, therefore, that the original word "hades," which carries with it the true sense, is generally being substituted, and so familiarized to the popular mind.

Question LXXIV. of the Catechism relates to infant baptism. We quote several striking passages.

"All nations are to be made disciples. Christianity is not the sum of a certain number of isolated, individual persons, but an inward living organism into which old and young, large and small are of necessity entitled to reception. The family is dedicated unto the Lord, and whole nations are to be dedicated unto Him. His blessing rests upon the whole house and all its inmates, sanctifying each member of it. . . ." Pp. 333-4.

"Rightfully the Catechism points to the circumcision of the old covenant, and declares that baptism has been put into its place in the New Covenant, now of course in evangelic fulness. *Circumcision was the solemn reception of the new-born child from the people of Israel into the covenant of promise. Baptism is the solemn reception of the new-born child from the people of the spiritual Israel of the regeneration into the Covenant of grace*, of which the word of the promise also holds true, that it shall be "unto you and your children." As circumcision was not in itself a guarantee that all who had received it were true sons of Abraham, so also the act of baptism is no guarantee that its subject may not squander the inheritance to which he is called by it. But if the baptized person retains this inheritance in full possession, then baptism remains to him continually the sacred sign and seal of that unchanging paternal love which in the earliest days of his being took pity, and impressed on him, in the holy Sacrament, the kiss of forgiveness, so that his first lispings of prayer might be *Abba Father*." Pp. 335-6.

These ideas flow in singular harmony with the manifest sense of the Catechism. They indicate also what must be the nature of our author's observations on the sacrament of baptism itself, as he feels himself constrained to make them in the light and under the influence of the questions and answers relating directly to it. We may therefore pass on, and give our attention to his statement of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Some of the sentences are difficult to translate with justice to every shade of their meaning, and fidelity, at the same time, to English usage. We have sought to do right, as much as possible in each direction.

"Of the first sacrament we have spoken as joining us to the company of the redeemed. Those who have received life from God in baptism, have this life continuously upheld and secured in the holy supper. As its preservation necessarily presupposes the life itself, reference can only here be had to such as prove the possession of this life by their faith. Hence the evident truth that the Lord's Supper is intended for believers only, and that they alone receive what it is appointed to confirm and seal to us." Pp. 340-1.

That the foregoing paragraph is thoroughly Reformed all who have an acquaintance with Reformed symbols at once see. Is it not equally the doctrine on the subject which meets us in the New Testament and in the Church of the first centuries?

From the explanation of the doctrinal teachings of the Catechism, under our present head, we quote as follows:

"The Lord's Supper is represented as the visible holy sign of the blessed divine truth that we have part in the one offering of Christ on the cross and in all His benefits. This sign rests on firmest foundation: The command of Christ and its indwelling promise. God so wills it: therefore it is thus; for His will is sure as a rock. And God's will and promise to believers is that as certainly as I receive this sign of bread and wine so certainly has Christ now also for me offered His body and shed His blood on the cross. Bread and wine witness to me the truth of this act of God's love, convince the eye, as the ear has already been convinced by the word, of the blessed work of Christ.

But not sign only, a seal also is the Lord's Supper. The holiest deed of God's love, as an abounding mystery into whose depths no searching human eye can pierce, holds with this sign, inwardly and intimately, as thought is contained in speech. With the outer transaction is bound up an inner act, well represented in that other, that audible means of grace, the preaching of the Gospel. The ear receives the sound-wave of the word in a mechanical manner, and mechanically, artificially sound and wave die away. Not simply sound, however, was it that touched the ear. With it was united wonderfully, mysteriously, the thought, intended not for the ear, which, as a passage-way only, enabled it to enter the region of thought and secure itself hospitable reception in the life of faith. Even such is the way of the visible sign. From the hand of the Lord's minister the believer receives the bread and the cup for his bodily sustenance; but with this outer, the Lord has connected, by innermost bonds, a spiritual transaction. Simultaneously with the bodily act, and mediated by it as hearing is the means of understanding, the soul of the believer eats and drinks of the Lord's crucified body and shed blood." Pp. 341-3.

We give the remarks of our author on the famous *Eightieth* question in full. It may be said of him that he goes here over unusually difficult ground with the clear perception of an enlightened theologian and the irenical spirit of a true Christian pastor, stating clearly and concisely the Reformed, and, we may add, the general Protestant position on this *questio vexata.*

"No question of the Catechism has called forth as much strife, or is connected with as large a history not in all respects to be approved, as this. With deep earnestness, but also with unforbearing decision, the justification for which must indeed be owned, it lays bare a perversion of the Lord's Supper. This, however, may be said, that it would probably have been better if this justification had been simply turned to use in a critical investigation, reaching the same conclusion of necessity from our stand-point, instead of in a popular hand-book which everywhere lays down the doctrines of Holy Scripture in a clear positive manner.

"In the first edition the Eightieth question is wanting. Shortly after its appearance news comes to Heidelberg that the Council of Trent in its last sessions, July 16th, and September 17th, 1562, had visited with heavy anathemas all those who failed to agree with the Catholic Church in the doctrine of transubstantiation, worship of Christ in the sacrament, offering of the mass, and withdrawal of the cup from the laity. This led Frederick III. of his own authority, to add the 80th question to the second edition, yet without the last clause. While it was going through the press, and when few copies of the second edition had as yet been given out, the Elector presumably received the literal wording of the Tridentine resolutions with their anathemas against the Evangelical Church, and allowed himself to be influenced by it to add to the 80th question in the third edition, the sentence: "so that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry."

Thus offense is made to stand against offense; on the side of the Elector an angry acceptance of the challenge which the entire Council had offered to the youthful Church—a living picture of those unkindly days of strife for the possession of the truth.

"To an evangelic mind entering wholly with hearty trust and confidence into the spirit of Scripture, and drawing bountifully the streams of the all-gracious love of God from that fountain, it is matter of discomfort to see and feel what has become in the hands of men of the holy sign and seal of the eternal divine truth of our communion with Christ. The whole world scarcely affords a greater perversion, and the honest soul may well fear in sight of such delusion.

"By one offering He (Christ) hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. By His own blood He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others:

for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many."

"A prophetic vein runs through these words of the Epistle to the Hebrews. They stand there witnessing against views to which coming centuries first gave form. It is the earnest protest of the Apostles, as though forward over the grave, against a doctrine, which, in full contradiction of Scripture, declares that both the living and the dead have only then the forgiveness of sins through Christ's sufferings, if He is daily offered by the priests in the mass. What an inexpressibly misconceived idea! that daily, in thousands and thousands of churches, there transpires repeatedly a fact whose original occurrence, once for all, made the soul of the Saviour sorrowful unto death, and called forth from Him the words of anguish, '*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*'

"Holy Scripture teaches, furthermore, that we become incorporated into Christ, the High Priest, who sits at the right hand on the throne of the majesty in heaven, He having ascended into heaven and remaining there until He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. But in the mass they teach that Christ abides not in heaven alone, but, as in the days of His flesh, is bodily, though under the form of bread and wine, present here on earth. Holy Scripture enjoins us to seek that which is above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, and declares that He will there be worshiped; the mass teaches to bow the knee before the bread enclosed in the monstrance inasmuch as Christ is not in heaven but in it.

"Frederick the Third calls this with full right a denial of the one offering of Jesus Christ. He describes it correctly as idolatry, in so far as before the host, that is, before a creature, obeisance is made and worship given, whereas we are to worship God the Lord, and Him only." Pp. 356-60.

ART. VI.—THE UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN IN JESUS CHRIST.

BY DR. L. SCHŒBERLEIN, PROF. AND CONSISTORIALRATH IN GOTTINGEN.

No one who has ever contemplated the character of Jesus, has been able to deny His intellectual and moral greatness. What He has spoken is so simple and thoroughly intelligible, and yet, at the same time, so exalted and profound, it so strangely penetrates the inmost recesses of the soul and works conviction therein, His life is so immaculate, His personality stands before us so exalted, and all His actions are so thoroughly pervaded, notwithstanding His holy earnestness and zeal, with such an utterly unselfish, compassionate, self-sacrificing and helpful love, and this His high and pure disposition, He maintained so consistently and perfectly even in persecution and suffering even to the death on the cross, that of all men who have lived in the world, no one has appeared more exalted than He; aye, that no one can even be compared with Him.

But have we done full justice to the person of Jesus, when we have said of Him: He is the greatest among the children of men? His disciples saw something higher in Him; they speak of a glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father, which they saw in Him full of grace and truth. And what is yet more, He ascribes to Himself a dignity superior to that of other men, calls God His Father in a special sense, and speaks of a glory which He had with Him before the foundation of the world, and with which He would again glorify Him. These are words of infinite weight; since if they are not true, they destroy His intellectual and moral greatness, and place Him far below other heroes of humanity; but if, as cannot be otherwise, they are truth, they require us in our mind and spirit, to admit the divine, which was manifested in Him. The Church, therefore, on the ground of this testimony of Christ with regard to Himself, and of the unanimous declaration of His disciples and apostles, as also on the ground of her own infallible experience of the regenerating and beautifying power of His Spirit, has from the beginning believed and confessed Him to be the only begotten Son of God, who from love to us became man; and this faith is so deeply rooted in her consciousness, that with it she stands or falls.

But how are we to understand this union of the divine and human in the person of Christ?

This point would present but little difficulty, if we were allowed to regard the divine in Him as a special measure of the divine Spirit, which, either at His birth or at His baptism, was communicated to Him. He would then appear before us as one of the prophets, as that prophet of Israel, who had been endowed above all other prophets with the Spirit of God. The union of these two elements would also become more easily understood, if we accept what is taught from an opposite direction, viz.: that the divine, which from the beginning was immanent in the world, had at the proper time (in the person of Jesus) fully manifested itself and assumed a visible form; and that therefore He is to be regarded as the foreordained bearer of the divine in the history of mankind. According to the former hypothesis, the divine is regarded as a higher endowment communicated to men; according to the latter as an inborn power of man; and in the case of Jesus we would only be required to complement these views by asserting that this general gift to men was imparted to Christ in its highest measure; or, that this power of the divine naturally immanent in the human race, had in Jesus arrived at its perfect effervescence.

There is a measure of truth in both of these views. Jesus was really anointed with the Holy Ghost in a special measure, and He is designated in the Holy Scriptures as the promised prophet, as the Prophet of prophets. Jesus is really the spiritual perfection of humanity, the true central fact of world-history, the second and spiritual Adam, who, just as the first Adam was the beginning of its natural life, became for it the principle of its spiritual life. But does this do full justice to the divine in Jesus? Not as mere gift or natural property, not as mere power or particular manifestation, does the picture of the divine in Jesus, which the Scriptures give, present itself to us; but it appears in Him in true personal form.

An independent existence, which He possessed from eternity is ascribed to Him, when it is said of the Word which had become Flesh in Jesus, that it was "in the beginning" (John i. 1); and when Jesus testifies concerning Himself: "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58). And this existence, although divine in its nature, is again distinguished from the existence of God, when John says of this eternal Word on the one hand, "the word was God;" and on the other hand, "the Word was with God;" when, moreover, he speaks of Him as the "only begotten Son," who from eternity was "in the bosom of the Father" (John i. 18), and had "a glory with the Father before the world was" (John xvii. 5); and when Paul calls Him "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature," (Col. i. 15); when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Him "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person" (Heb. i. 3). And if it is implied already in these passages, that the Son, in this His existence before time, is not to be regarded as a mere *impersonal* principle, but as a true *personal* being; this finds still further confirmation from the fact that He is represented as working independently, when John says further of that Word which was eternally God, with God, that: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." (John i. 3): When Paul declares of this image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, that "all things were created by Him, and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." (Col. i. 16-17). Nor does it less imply a personal existence from eternity, when the Son is said to have been sent by the Father, and when Jesus in a like sense says: "I came forth from the Father: again I go to the Father." (John xvi. 28).

What is presented to us here in these passages of Scripture, stands also in essential harmony with the nature and life of God, as the Church, also on the ground of the Scriptures, understands and teaches it. If we were required to worship in God only a lawgiver, who has prescribed to the human race a certain order of life, and, if they virtuously live according to it has promised to them eternal happiness, then, in order to bring back to the path of righteousness and virtue the race that had departed from this norm, it might have been sufficient if God had sent down upon a certain man a special measure of His Spirit with a view to clearer knowledge and holy power, so that, as prophet and Messias, He might by precept and example show the path of virtue to others. Finally, if we see in God only that power and that life, which pervades the entire world, and gradually acquires consciousness in the increasing civilization and morality of the human race; if, in this way, we do not attribute unto God a personal and independent existence over and above humanity, then we may perhaps speak eloquent words concerning the divine, or concerning the indwelling of God in Jesus: but yet viewed more closely, Jesus is after all nothing more than a son of man, like the rest of us, and it is only a greater measure of natural endowment, which distinguishes Him from us, and assigns to Him a position, prominent above that of all others, in the development of the human race. The Church of Christ knows and has a different God, a living, personal one, who stands free as Lord over all His creatures. And this, His lordship, is no lordship of mere power, or of abstract law; on the contrary the inmost life of His nature *is love;* and when He created us, He appointed us to be His children, in order to communicate with us as a father with his children. How otherwise can this His love satisfy itself, how otherwise can this our estate as children become truth and life, than by entering our creatural nature and thus becoming personally united to us? And after we were plunged by sin into darkness and death, was it possible for Him to leave His children to themselves, although certainly we deserved nothing else at His hands? Or could it have delivered us from the chains of darkness, and could thus the power of death have been broken, if He had presented to us as pattern and guide a man endowed with higher gifts of knowledge and virtue? No, in such a case only love in personal form can save, and only by following her children into their misery can she satisfy her own nature. The same love, which in God eternally generated the Son, and created us in the image of the Son, it is, which in its own heart from eternity determined to show mercy towards us, and sent the Son into the world to save us, who without Him would have perished. But the Son, as He fulfils all the will of God, accepted also with the eternal compassion of love this counsel of redemption and left the bosom of the Father; He, the only begotten, in order to take upon Himself the nature of His created though apostate image, and, restoring in Himself this image in its full truth, thus to restore us as children of God. And the Holy Ghost, who in God and His kingdom is the medium of love, by His divine power brought the eternal Son into humanity, in order thus also to be in this temporal existence of the Son the bond between Him and His heavenly Father, and to be the agent in the accomplishment of His work of redemption.

The Divine counsel of redemption has its root thus in the triune love of God itself. From eternity already, when God yet bore in His heart the design of creation, His wisdom had its delight in the children of men. (Prov. 8:31.) The eye of the Father's love turns from eternity through the Son towards man, the work of His good pleasure. And the Son, the principle of the revelation of the Divine nature, has from all eternity His life not in Himself, but in the surrender of His heart and nature to mankind, which forever presents itself in the glory of His own image to His mind and spirit. In like manner also the Son from all eternity looks upon man not otherwise than in blessed union with Himself, man's prototype, that so through love He may reflect the image of His holiness and righteousness. (Eph. 4:10.) The *human-divine character of the Son* is hence an *everlasting fact*, and the above-cited Scriptural references concerning the eternal personality of the Son can be fully understood only from this point of view. And if, in order to distinguish this everlasting human-divine nature from its actualization in time, we designate it as an *ideal* one, this must nevertheless not be understood in the sense of a mere thought, or of an abstract decree, but as that full power of life, according to which ideas are the final and highest cause of everything real, and are therefore themselves the completest realities. When therefore God had created man in the image in which He had from everlasting contemplated him in the God-man, we must not be surprised that God, as the Scriptures tell us, walked and conversed with man in paradise, in which He had placed him. This paradisaic revelation of God to man is only the first terrestrial expression of that eternal desire of divine love, to dwell with the children of men. But this love of God to the children of men has not been destroyed by sin; its method of expression has only been changed to accommodate it to the changed condition of things, and thus it has become stronger, deeper, and more confirmed. (1 Peter, 1 : 19, 20 ; Rev. 13 : 8.) And that the Lord God visited Abraham, that He spoke with Moses from the burning bush and from the thunders of Sinai, that in the pillar of fire and the pillar of a cloud He led His people, that by the angel of His covenant He gave commands and promises, and by His Spirit gave prophecies of salvation to the elect of His people, in order to prepare them for the fulfillment of the same all these are only significant preludes for His actual entrance into humanity, and for His abiding and walking in our flesh. But when the time was fulfilled, when the insufficiency of all human power and wisdom to overcome the power of sin had been historically proved; when the civil and social life of the people had arrived at that point, that a way was opened to their hearts to admit the testimony of the grace of God; when, above all, the Lord had, by the institutions of the law and by the promises of the prophets, prepared for Himself a suitable dwelling-place in the midst of His chosen people of Israel; then the Son of God Himself appeared in the flesh, in order that, having passed through a life in the flesh even unto death, He might, by taking upon Himself in the obedience of love, all the consequences of our sin, blot out for us the guilt and power of sin.

But how, now, is this wonderful event, that the Son of God became man, man in the flesh, to be understood?

That this could not have taken place in the ordinary way of nature, that the Son of God could be born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, this needs no farther demonstration. For independent of the fact, that in this way Jesus would have taken part by birth in our sinful nature, although He had come to break in the nature of the flesh the power of sin, the state of the case here was otherwise than in the ordinary birth of a human being, where the person, which by the will of God was to enter into the world, had previously had no existence. But here this person is already existing, existing in the Son of God, who from all eternity had been in the form of God, but who now, denying Himself out of love to us, took upon Himself the form of a servant, that so, by becoming like unto us, He might make us like unto Himself.

Just as little could the incarnation take place by the Son of God uniting Himself with a man already in existence. For in such a case a twofold personality would come into existence, since in Jesus the personality of the eternal Son of God, and the personality of a man already existing in time, would become united. The dualism of this personality could in such a case be avoided only by confining the indwelling of the Son of God to a constant spiritual influence, which the Son of God would exert upon this chosen man. But this, after all, would be essentially the same view as the one we have already set aside, which sees in Jesus a mere man, though filled in an extraordinary degree with the Spirit of God. It could not be called a real incarnation.

No, the Son of God, when He became man, did not enter a man, but took upon Himself *human nature*. But for the very reason that He entered into human nature, He could not exist in it with divine self-consciousness—for personality and nature form a harmonious union in respect to essence, and the particular manner of self-consciousness is conditioned by the particular manner of nature, and the reverse—but He could exist in it only with human self-consciousness. In order to become *really* human, it was necessary for Him, in taking upon Himself human nature, to make His personality (His self-conscious *ego*) a truly human one. Whilst from eternity He had existed as a *divine* person in the holy life-cycle of the divine trinity, it now became necessary for Him to become a *human person* in the *human nature of the flesh*, in order that, becoming like us in all things, above all in His self-consciousness, He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. (Heb. 2 : 17.)

This took place by the power of the Father through the Holy Spirit. The Virgin Mary was the chosen one from the sinful human race, who was to become the mother of the Lord; she who, descended from the family of David, was by her humility and faith prepared to receive this holy gift from the bosom of the Father. The Holy Ghost came upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her. And she, as a poor child of man, conceived and gave birth to the only begotten of the Father. (Luke 1 : 35.)

He became like unto us in *all things*. He took upon Himself no mere apparent body, but a real body, the body of the creature; not a body of a paradisaic nature, much less a glorified body; for how could such a body have engrafted itself organically upon this world of flesh, and how die for us? On the contrary, it was a *body of the flesh*, like unto our own present body, unfolding itself from year to year according to the law of growth, subject to all the necessities, wants and infirmities of terrestrial existence, yea, bearing in Himself the germ of death, in order truly to bear for us the wages of sin, in order to be able to suffer and die for us.

But the humanity which He took upon Himself consisted not merely in His body, whilst His eternal *deus-ego* was substituted for his Human *soul*. For the soul is the most special characteristic of man, the very bearer of the human self-conscious I. And if He had not at the same time a human soul, His becoming man would have been a mere sham. This appears most plainly from all that the Scriptures report concerning Him. He learned, thought, investigated and increased, both in years and wisdom; He shared our feelings of joy and sorrow, He had human inclinations and aims, and proceeded from the dim desire of the good forward to the clear apprehension and steadfast prosecution of this His life-aim. Thus He became altogether like unto us, both in body and soul, only with one exception, viz.: that, since He had not become man in the way of natural generation, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, He did not share in that inclination to sin, which is the heritage of all the children of Adam; but that as a new and spiritual Adam of the race, he was free from inborn inclination to sin, and that he was by nature as pure, as the first Adam came pure from the hands of the Creator.

But if Jesus thus became in body and soul like unto us, sin excepted, may not then, perhaps, His divine nature have taken in Him the place of our *spirit?* This also we must deny. The creative Spirit from God, which has been imparted to our nature as the principle of life, belongs to the very integrity of this our nature. For just through this, His natural immanence in our soul, our consciousness becomes self-consciousness, our thinking and willing receives the form of reason and liberty, and we ourselves become capable of communion with God. But if Jesus had not taken part in this, the highest which belongs to the constitution of man, in this fundamental force of all spiritual and intellectual life, how could He have become the noblest of the children of men, or how could He have represented in His person the very flower of humanity?

Thus Jesus was *true man* also, man in the fullest sense of the word. And this man Jesus is no other *ego* than the *ego* of the eternal Son, which became man in Him.

But did nothing of His divine nature pass over into this His human form of existence? If this were to be understood as if Jesus during His walk on earth had borne in Himself alongside of His human feeling, thinking, willing and working another divine feeling, thinking, willing and working, then we would be forced to deny it. For the verity of the humanity of Jesus would necessarily be compromised, if, in the terrestrial man Jesus His divine nature had been united in self-conscious activity with His human nature. And this objection may be urged against every manner, in which we may think of this union. If we suppose that the two were mixed together, and were thus changed into one nature, then Jesus is not a true-God-man, but rather something between God and man, of which it were difficult to form a clear conception. And if we suppose that they existed in Jesus *separated* and alongside of each other, then we would admit in Him a dual personality, which had performed some things on earth with divine, and other things with human consciousness and will; but with this the harmonious image of the person of Christ would be lost.

But even if we conceive of the union as something midway between mixture and separation, which is in itself the true manner of a real union, it would nevertheless be a mistake to locate it in the temporal life of Jesus on earth. This becomes very apparent, if we form in reference to this union the conclusion, which by itself is also true (and which has been formed by the Lutheran Church in the Form of Concord), that thereby a living communication of attributes from the divine to the human nature has taken place. For if with the Suabian theologians (in the controversy at the beginning of the seventeenth century on this point), we assert, that Jesus, whilst with the powers of His human nature He performed His work of redemption, secretly with the powers of His divine nature continues to govern heaven and earth; or assert with the theologians of Hessen, that Jesus, although He possessed the divine nature, had denied Himself the exercise of it, except in special cases, such as miracles, where He suffered it to appear; by both assertions the image of Christ as of a true man is spoiled. For whilst the former supposition, by the distinction which it makes between that which was manifest and that which was concealed, invests the person of Jesus with a dim and magical haze; so the latter introduces, by an arbitrary use of His divine powers, an element of change into His works.

No, if we would conceive of the self-abnegation of the Son of God in becoming man as a real one, then we must proceed to the conclusion, that He had left behind Him His heavenly glory (John 17 : 5), aye, even His divine form (Phil. 2 : 6, 7), *i. e.*, the divine manner of His being, thinking and working, and that He had not brought these along with Him into His earthly condition of servant. On earth Jesus was not omnipotent, although He performed great miracles, and was able even to perform them independent of space (Matt. 6: 5, 13); for He gave His disciples the promise that they should perform still greater miracles than His (John 14 : 12), and the power for His own miracles He obtained from the Father by prayer (John 10: 25, 37, 11: 41). Just as little did He on earth possess omnipresence, but He ascended into heaven, to fill all things. (Eph. 4: 10). Nor was He omniscient, although His perception was deeper than that of other children of flesh (John 2 : 25); for the day of judgment was unknown to Him, and He knew of it as little as the angels: the Father alone knew it (Mark 13: 32). Just as little as He did anything on earth with divine power, just so little did He do it with divine consciousness and will. As a general thing, nothing is to be found in His life, which transcended the bounds of human nature, so far as this is apprehended in its purity and spiritual power, and which His followers, although only through Him, the spiritual Adam, and in a manner different according to the central position which He holds, might do and live after Him.

Just in this way the Son of God in His incarnation has manifested the nature of love, which in its perfect participation and communication is always accompanied in its self-surrendry by self-denial

But what is the extent of this self-denial on the part of divine love, this self-abnegation (Kenosis—Phil. ii. 7. ἑαυτοὺ ἑϰὲνωϑε) of the Son of God in His incarnation?

In more recent times the opinion has been advanced, that the Son of God, when He became man, actually renounced His Godhead, that during the time of His earthly career extending over several decades, He was not God at all, that during this time the Father ceased to beget the Son, and the Son ceased to send forth the Holy Ghost as well as to rule over heaven and earth in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Ghost. It is only at His exaltation that the Son again receives His divinity from the Father as a reward for His redemptive work in the flesh.* However willing we may be to recognize in this theory a decisive tendency to make earnest with the self-abnegation involved in the incarnation as an act of love, and to guard against all interference of divine consciousness and activity in the earthly person of the man Jesus, we cannot help thinking that in this way violence is done to another and a no less essential side of the character of love, that namely according to which love, with all its earnestness of self-surrendry to another, does yet not renounce itself, but rather even in its deepest self-denial, maintains its own character as well as its natural and moral individuality, just as it also asserts and preserves its holiness and righteousness in its mercy and grace.

That the Son is begotten of the Father and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son is a relation grounded in the very nature of the Godhead, as we have it expressed in the dogma of the trinity. In this relation it is therefore utterly impossible to eliminate either one side or the other. Begetting belongs to the essential nature of the Father. He *has* not merely begotten the Son, He *begets* Him eternally (according to the teaching of Scripture and of the Church). Would therefore the Father still be Father if He ceased to beget the Son? And would not the nature of the Holy Ghost be changed, if He proceeded only from the Father and not at the same time from the Son? If the Son passes out of this essential relation for a time does the trinity become a duality? And is a duality still the true godhead? Thus this doctrine of the absolute *Kenosis* does violence to the nature of the divine trinity. And this is true also of the activity of the trinity. Every activity of God in the preservation and government of the world proceeds *from* the Father, *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Ghost. Hence the "through" of the divine activity cannot be interrupted for a time, as would be the necessary consequence if the Son should withdraw from the communion of the divine life; for the preservation of that which exists is a continuous activity of God, which accomplishes its end essentially in this threefold form. Neither can this activity of the Son be temporarily assumed by the Father or the Holy Ghost, because these persons of the trinity in distinction from the Son already have their definite place in the divine activity, and because moreover this reciprocity of "from," "through," and "in" is grounded in the immanent relation of the divine persons to one another.

---

* Gess, die Lehre von der Person Christi, entwickelt aus dem Bewustsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel. Basel, 1856.

But this hypothesis of an absolute *kenosis* is in conflict not only with the nature and activity of the trinity but also with the nature of the Son as *absolute* personality, as *God*, which He is equally with the Father and the Holy Ghost. True the Son has life not from Himself, but has received it from the Father. The Father, however, has at the same time given to Him to have life in Himself, and thus to be God absolutely as the Father. Now how can the Son cease absolutely to be God, and suffer His divine self-consciousness to be extinguished? Just as little as God, inasmuch as He is absolute love, can ever cease to assert this His moral self, *i. e.*, cease to be good, to be love, so little can He inasmuch as He is absolute spirit, renounce His metaphysical self, *i. e.* cease to be absolute Spirit, to be God. This would not be self-abnegation, but self-transformation.

If we look at the formal side of the subject we meet with the same difficulties for thought. That the Son is begotten of the Father, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both, and that the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost govern heaven and earth, involves a relation which is neither concluded once for all, nor yet as something that becomes established through succession in time, but which subsists in an eternal present, and is yet continuously bringing itself to pass. How now can this eternal present, which itself does not run through a course of years, be interrupted, say for thirty years? Would not this be *to transfer time into eternity?* Even though eternity, so far as it is living existence, admits of a certain kind of *unfolding* (Entfaltung), which cannot be conceived of without a certain succession, this unfolding must be regarded as essentially different from development (Entwickelung) to which all life in time is subject. As eternity has its own mode of life, so also, has it its own basis of life, which cannot be interrupted or temporarily suspended by life in time. If the Son of God enters into time as man, He lives through a course of temporal existence, and experiences the gradual development of our human life, but in His divine being itself, He can by no means have a temporal experience of the succession of time life, without interfering with the eternity which is an attribute of His divine life, or even abrogating the eternity of the Godhead itself.

Thus the doctrine of the absolute *kenosis* of the Son of God in the incarnation, encounters insuperable difficulties. This has been felt by others,* who avoiding the extreme consequence that the Son of God renounced His divine being, have confined themselves to the assumption that He surrendered only His divine glory, whilst yet He did not cease to retain possession of His divine being. This view seems somewhat plausible at first, and appears to be in harmony with Holy Scripture, when Jesus speaks of a glory which He had with the Father before the foundation of the world, which however He did not possess on earth, and yet would receive again from the Father. But we must not forget that the Scriptures go further and speak also of a divine form, of an equality with God, which the Son of God laid aside during the time of His earthly life. If now these words should be made to mean that this laying aside of His glory involves a real temporary cessation of the same it would be necessary also to draw the same inference in regard to His equality with God. And accordingly this limitation of the *kenosis* is, to say the least, in closer harmony with the Scriptures, than the kenosis in its absolute form. Apart from this want of harmony with the Scriptures, this view involves intrinsic difficulties of no trifling character. For where is the boundary between the glory of the divine being, and the divine being itself? Some have placed it in this, that the Son of God laid aside only His divine attributes (Eigenschaften), and not His essential divine qualities, (Wesensbestimmtheiten). Among the former are reckoned His omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence; but among the latter His truth, holiness, justice, etc., or in other words His moral constitution. But apart from the arbitrary change in the use of terms—for we are accustomed also to reckon God's holiness, truth, etc., among His attributes—it is difficult to see how the Son of God can lay aside absolute knowledge and power, and yet retain in His knowledge and volition the form of the absolute. Absoluteness is just that which distinguishes the divine as such. If absolute knowledge and volition are incompatible with self-abnegation, how can absoluteness in knowledge and volition be compatible with it? Absoluteness is altogether incompatible with the nature of temporal being. And when the Son of God condescends to become the man Jesus, His holiness, truth etc., without ceasing to be holy, true, etc., necessarily assumes a created, human form. We are confirmed in this belief when we apply it to the life of Jesus. How, for example, is it possible to conceive that the Son of God whilst on earth ceased to know all that He knew before, and began with knowing nothing at all in order that He might again gradually acquire knowledge? On the other hand, if Jesus whilst in the flesh, possessed absolute divine holiness—which however, the Scriptures distinctly deny,* how could the temptation which actually and necessarily confronted Him, be for Him a real temptation, inasmuch as God cannot be tempted to evil?†

---

* Thomasius, Beiträge zur Kirchlichen Christologie. 1845. Also, Christi Person und Werk, 1845.

The way in which it is attempted to explain how the Son of God laid aside His glory in His divine activity, is arbitrary in a similar manner. The proposition is laid down that the Son of God in His incarnation transformed His eternal demiurgic activity (as manifested in the natural preservation and government of the world) into a redemptive activity; and that ever since He preserves the world only in that He reconciles it with God. True, His expiation is a spiritual preservation of the world. But if we were to make earnest with this thought it would be necessary to draw the inference that the specific activity of the Son had this spiritual form from all eternity, as well as in the preparation for the incarnation and redemption, and that it held in this form alone. To assume however that the Son of God, before His incarnation, co-operated in the natural creation and preservation of the world, but from the time of His incarnation ceased from this natural activity and instead of it assumed the spiritual activity of redemption—this breaks up the unity of the divine activity, and rests at the same time upon a misapprehension of the significance which attaches to the natural activity of God, as the basis continually of His spiritual activity. The purpose of the incarnation for the redemption of humanity, existed from eternity. Now if, notwithstanding this, the Son of God participated in the demiurgic activity of God before His manifestation in the flesh, then He must continue to participate in it beyond the period of His redemptive work to the final completion of all things, even though this activity is in unity with His redemptive activity in such sense that it is its basis as from the beginning.

---

* Matt. xix. 17; Heb. v. 8.

† James i. 13.

Accordingly, this supposition of a merely partial self-abnegation necessitates assumptions which cannot stand before the forum of strict science. And in what difficulties, moreover, do we become involved with regard to the Divine in the man Jesus? If we suppose that the Son of God remained God in His incarnation, it is necessary to assume that when He became incarnate, His Godhead sank into a state of total unconsciousness, in order to rise gradually again into clear God-consciousness. And how then, in the further development of Jesus, is His God-consciousness, which remains unchanged in His entire inner life, compatible with the self-consciousness of His earthly personality, which is in all respects that of a created being? These difficulties in which the doctrine of a limited *kenosis* is involved, are in truth inferior to those which stand in the way of the doctrine of an absolute *kenosis.* And yet, by giving up the logical consequence of this self-abnegation we do not even escape what we have above recognized as an inevitable necessity; viz.: that by the incarnation in time, the specific flow of eternity is interrupted and broken.

The true conception of the union of the divine and the human in Jesus becomes evident to us from the nature of love. It is the very nature of love to take part in the life of the beloved object. And divine love, in virtue of the absoluteness of its relation to the creature, is capable of doing this in such an absolute sense that it assumes the very nature of the creature made in its image. The Son of God, as the Son of man, Jesus, lives on earth truly and purely as man in the flesh, with human consciousness and will, according to the laws of earthly temporal existence. Thus far we assent to the above doctrine of the *kenosis.* But we have regard at the same time to the essential limits of love. And these consist in this, that love, whilst in fullest self-surrendry, it takes part in the life of its object, does nevertheless not surrender to its object its own being, and with this its natural and moral individuality; it much rather preserves this individuality in order to complement its own being by communicating to and receiving from another, and to bring to pass in this way mutual personal union, which is the highest and last end of love. For this reason (and in this respect we dissent from this doctrine, the kenosis) it is necessary to add to the proposition which we have considered, the following: *When the Son of God became man, He by no means renounced His divine nature, and the demiurgic activity connected with it; but with divine consciousness and divine power He eternally in Heaven, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rules over all things.*

In order to understand this, we must not seek the union of the divine and human forms of existence, primarily in the self-consciousness of the earthly man, Jesus, but at the point whence the incarnation itself proceeds, namely, in the Son of God, who in Jesus became man. Inasmuch as the Son of God as the eternal Logos, created man in the image of God, and adapted him to communion with God, there exists, according to the power of love, as we have above seen, from all eternity, an ideal union of the Son of God with humanity, since the Son of God desires no other relation for Himself than that of union with the creature made in His image, that is humanity; and desires and looks upon humanity in no other relation than in union with Himself. All created existence, which is eternally thought and willed by God, enters by internal necessity into Him, and real existence in order to become actual. This holds good also of the ideal humanity of the Son of God; its manifestation in the flesh is only the revelation and actualization in time of that eternal relation. And that this ideal humanity did not shrink from following man after he fell from God by sin, into the consequences of his sin, even unto death, this is only the manifestation of the entire height and depth, power and truth of the love which eternally fills and moves the heart of the Son towards humanity. This actualization in time of the eternal humanity of the Son of God carries with it, however, the necessary consequence, that the union of God and man, which exists eternally (ideally) in the Son, shall now pass over into the antithesis of the eternal and the temporal, of the heavenly and the earthly; for the divine form of existence, as this lies in the nature of the absolute, remains bound to heaven and eternity, whilst the human form of existence descends from its eternal heavenly ideality into the temporal earthly reality. This, however, takes place in such a way that the essential eternal union of the two forms of existence in the Son of God is not destroyed.

On the basis of divine love and grace, there exists rather in the Son of God the union of a double mode of existence. He both wills and knows Himself at the same time in a divine, eternal, and in a human, temporal existence: uniting and yet distinguishing both in Himself, He, the same *ego* that is from eternity and to eternity, is also in time; there without beginning and end, here during the span of a human life; there as the unlimited, here as the finite, limited; there with eternal consciousness and divine will, here with a divine consciousness and human will—yet in such a manner that He, existing in one mode, knows Himself to be one with the other and *vice versa.*

This relation may be compared to a centre with two qualitatively different peripheries: the one common centre is the *ego* of the Son of God, and the two peripheries are His divine and His human modes of existence, the former belonging to heaven and eternity, the latter to earth and time. This double existence of the Son of God might at first seem to involve a double personality. The reason of this is, that in order to form a perfect conception, a twofold mode of existence of the Son of God, we must assume a twofold point of view, the one in time, the other in eternity. But the knowledge acquired from these two stand-points may be comprehended in the actuality of *one person*. And the appearance of a double personality vanishes as soon as we rightly apprehend the relation of time and eternity, of heaven and earth, into which the life of the Son of God appears to be divided.

Heaven and earth, time and eternity are not qualitatively identical, and only quantitatively different. Each of them has its special life, and on the basis of this, its special mode of existence. In eternity as the form of perfected life, we have to do no longer with earthly development, but with heavenly unfolding (*Entfaltung*). And if in this latter we may also assume a succession, it is still not of such a kind that the moments are separate and mutually exclusive, but rather that they are essentially in one another. And accordingly we can not find in eternity a parallelism of experience with our time life. For the eternity of the divine Logos, the time of His earthly humiliation during thirty odd years, is not a period which He has experienced in the same manner in His eternal consciousness as a succession of years; it is only a point, and that not measurable in time, but rather a mathematical point.* It is necessary to suppose that the earthly realization of the purpose of humiliation, is taken up into the consciousness of the Son of God in the same eternal moment in which He formed that purpose, so that there can arise no moment of time, much less a series of years in which the *ego* of the Son of God could have been really separated into the two forms of existence, namely, the heavenly, eternal and the earthly time-life, as into two divided halves running parallel to each other. Furthermore nothing new enters into the consciousness of the Son of God through the actualization in time of that eternal purpose, inasmuch as His earthly humanity is only the issue completed in time of a personal union with humanity through love—a union which, in essential ideality, exists from all eternity as the ideal incarnation.

---

* Ps. 90: 4. 2 Pet. 3:8.

Nor can we find a point of connection for a twofold personal existence in the consciousness of the Man Jesus, any more than in the consciousness of the eternal Logos. For His eternal being did not for His human mode of apprehension in time, run parallel with His earthly being, nor did His heavenly consciousness and activity ever enter His human experience, much less did He make use of His heavenly consciousness and activity for Himself and His redemptive work; but rather just as the eternal life for which we hope appears to *our* minds as something future, although it does not lie for us purely in the future, but is already in principle implanted in us through faith, so also the divine glory of Jesus did not enter into His consciousness as something present, but as something future, as a gift which He should receive from His Father only as a reward. And in respect to this, His self-consciousness differs from ours only in the fact, that it is for Him not something merely future, but also something past, because independently of His incarnation He existed already from eternity as *ego* in the divine Trinity, but laid aside His eternal form of existence, when He became incarnate.

And what is true of eternity is true also of heaven as the sphere to which His divine form of existence belongs. The relation of heaven to earth (by heaven, however, we mean not the cosmical heaven of sun, moon, and stars, but the hyperphysical heaven; the invisible place of perfection*) is not one of space in the earthly sense, so that Heaven may be found at a certain measurable distance from us in the universal cosmical space. Heaven, for our earthly existence in space, is much rather a place above the category of space. Hence it was not necessary for the Son of God, when He became man, to travel a great distance; and just as little is heaven a place which for the man Jesus lay at a remote inaccessible point. His Father was everywhere near to Him, and the angels of heaven were constantly ascending from and descending upon Him.* There was therefore neither in time nor in space a separation of the heavenly and earthly existence of the Son of God, so as to involve a double personality on His part as a consequence.

---

* 2 Cor. 4:18.

But not only was there no separation of the same; we ought rather to conceive of them in true living union. The relation between time and eternity, heaven and earth, is not one of mere juxtaposition; time and eternity, heaven and earth are at the same time in each other, and that according to the law of causation. Eternity is continuously the life basis from which time proceeds, and which it returns; and the earth reposes in heaven by which it is surrounded and pervaded. For eternity and heaven are the forms of existence for perfect life, for the world of ideas, and for the corresponding realities. Inasmuch as every creature contains within itself the idea of its being, which idea, as its true life, belongs to heaven and to eternity, it follows that time is wholly borne by eternity, and earth surrounded and controlled by heaven. And accordingly, in the case of any creature, the more fully the earthly reality and its idea have become one, the more fully does it partake of eternal life, even whilst it stands empirically in time.† And he whose spirit lives in perfect harmony with the idea of his being, has eternity already dwelling in him with all its fulness, and carries heaven with all its glory hidden, though it be essentially (not in an abstractly ideal manner), in himself, although it does not enter empirically into his earthly consciousness. If now we apply this knowledge to the incarnate Son of God, we can understand how His divine form of existence, although completely laid aside during His abode on earth as man, neither ceased to exist in general, nor yet existed outside of His earthly person either in time or space. We see rather that His eternal glory in heaven and His temporal form of a servant, His dwelling in heaven, and His walk upon earth, His demiurgic government in the Spirit, and His redemptive activity in the flesh belong equally to Him, to His single person.

---

* John 1:51.

† John 3:36. John 5:13.

This immanence is confirmed also by the declaration of Jesus Himself. For when He gives utterance to His personal feelings, He speaks of a glory which He *had* with the Father, and which the Father *will give* Him again* ; but on the other hand when He speaks as a teacher, and not from His immediate consciousness, He refers very distinctly to a presence and immanence of His being and power in His person; as for example when He declares to Nicodemus†: "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which *is* in heaven;" and when He testifies to the Jews‡: "Before Abraham was (not I was, but) I AM;" so also when John says §: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which IS in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." These expressions are true and intelligible in the light of the assumption that the Son of God, although He truly entered into time and became incarnate on earth, yet ceased not to dwell internally in heaven, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost to govern heaven and earth.

On the other hand, however, the truth of His self-abnegation, whereby for our sakes He became poor, is not destroyed by this assumption. For the Son of God indeed entered into the misery of the flesh, and lived thirty years in it, even in the deepest experience of sorrow and death; and during the time of His earthly career, His heavenly glory was for Him not something present which He possessed and enjoyed in secret, but something that lay beyond the limits of His earthly life, something that He had left behind and was only to receive again from the Father. It is just in this that we recognize the prototypal actualization of that double life, which love always lives, in which every true Christian imitates his Lord, when with heartfelt sympathy he enters into the misery of his suffering brother without losing or sacrificing peace with God in his soul. This peace with God is rather the fountain from which he derives strength to become poor for the poor, and to suffer with the suffering.

---

* John 17 : 5; 16 : 28.

† John 3 : 13.

‡ John 8 : 58.

§ John 1 : 18. Comp. 6 : 46.

We must therefore assume in the person of Jesus a real self-abnegation (*χένωσις*) of the Son of God, whilst yet He eternally retains the possession (*χτησις*) and use (*χρησις*) of His divine glory. There was a concealment (*χρυψις*) of this possession and use only in an objective sense in virtue of the concealed immanence of the eternal in the temporal, of the heavenly in the earthly; on the other hand in a subjective sense as a concealing or veiling in the sense of the old dogmatists, it would injure the pure image of His humanity, as well as by necessary consequence that of His divinity itself. There is accordingly no need of that unnatural, violent course which the later doctrine of the *kenosis* has taken, in order to set aside what is certainly one-sided and disproportionate in the old church doctrine. This is accomplished without departing from the earlier Church development of this doctrine, simply by limiting the subjective union of the two natures and modes of existence, the divine and the human, in the God-man, as well as the communication of the attributes of the divine to the human (*communicatio idiomatum*), to the state of exaltation; and on the other hand, assuming for the state of humiliation, a relative, subjective separation of the divine and the human modes of existence, not in such a way, however, that the *objective immanence* of the two is thereby excluded, or the unity of the person itself destroyed.

This mode of explanation has indeed been reproached as a speculation which prevents the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures. But in this charge the fact is entirely overlooked that the position and aim of science are altogether different from those of the biblical authors. The Scriptures appeal in their language to the popular consciousness, and hence immediately to human conception which sees the eternal in the form of the temporal. Science, however, rising from mere conception to pure thought, endeavors to distinguish the eternal from the temporal, and to apprehend it in its own essential nature. Mere reflection is incapable of doing this, speculative thought is necessary for its accomplishment, and theology can never dispense with speculation if it is to solve its problem; for the Scriptures, whenever they speak of heaven, eternal life, the spiritual glory, etc., move in a sphere which transcends the natural order. Instead, therefore, of perverting the words of Scripture, we, in this way, rather bring out their true meaning, whilst on the other hand, mere reflection, by cleaving externally to the literal conception, changes the eternal into the temporal, the heavenly into the finite, the divine into the human.

Thus we obtain a *unique image of the God-man*, when in contemplating the mystery of the incarnation we proceed from the stand-point of the *eternal Son,* who became man. We encounter the same unique image of the God-man when we occupy the stand-point of His *humanity in Jesus.* Here again we are not confronted by a double personality, but by one truly unique. It is only necessary clearly to apprehend and exhibit partly the manner in which the divine and the human are one in the person of Jesus, and partly the stages of development through which this union moves.

So far as the former is concerned, our safest course is to consider the manner in which universally the divine is by nature immanent in the being of man. By nature, the Spirit from God, through whom we were created, dwells in us, for nothing can subsist except through the immanence of the power by which it was made to exist. This Spirit from God in us involves already the original type of the God-man, inasmuch as communion with God, for which we are appointed in virtue of our likeness to God, is essentially mediated by the God-man. But this Spirit is not our *ego* itself, which thinks, feels and wills; He is rather the divine principle which enables us to think, feel and will in a human way. As He is the power of God in us, through which we are and subsist, so in Him we at the same time bear in us God's eternal ideal image of our nature, and the demands of His will in respect to our moral development. This Spirit from God in us, which we must apprehend as the union of the idea, will and power of God, accordingly forms in us the objective substratum on which our nature, with its development rests. Precisely now, as in creation, the Spirit of God in us became the substratum of our nature, in order that we might *truly become man*, so also the Son of God when He assumed human nature, made His divine being the substratum of His humanity in order that He might become *God-man.* Whilst our true human nature consists in this, that we have been thought, willed, and created men by God, and bear this divine idea, will, and power in our nature as its substratum, this indeed is also not wanting in the human nature of Jesus, since without this He would not be a true, full man. But He has at the same time still another substratum of His earthly nature, in virtue of which He, in distinction from us, is the God-man. It is this: The nature of the eternal Son of God has in His generation by the Holy Ghost, incorporated itself into His human nature (which by His self-abnegation came into earthly existence) as the objective principle of His being and forms the fundamental support of His earthly existence, the immanent authority of His development in time. And just as that Spirit from God, which is immanent in us by nature, is eternal, and thus capable of being the true power and unchangeable authority for our development in time, so also is that objective immanence of the divine nature of the Son in Jesus, a life belonging essentially to eternity, but implanted into the temporal humanity of Jesus as its life principle in order to serve an immanent power and authority for all stages of its earthly development, through which, like us, it must necessarily pass.

Yet this distinction between the principle of the human development of Jesus, and His divine-human development, must not be understood as if there were a division of the principles of His life. The two are rather in essential union with each other. For the divine nature of the Son has become the substratum of the person of Jesus, only to realize now in created form and in time the image of His divine prototypal nature for which man was created, but which he as a sinner could not and cannot realize. And on the other hand, the Spirit of God which is in Jesus by nature, and in which as man He bears the idea of His nature in Himself, forms the natural bearer of the immanence of the Logos ; so that the two in their union constitute the proper divine human principle in Jesus. This immanence of the Logos nature exerted its influence on the divine human development in Jesus, just as the immanance of the Spirit of God, which is in us by nature, exerts its influence upon the human development of all the children of men, and was in this way subject also to the same laws to which human life universally is subject for its development in time.

Jesus was not conscious of Himself only as man, as we all are ; but beyond this, and especially as the one in whom the eternal Son of God humbled Himself in time and in human form ; He was conscious that in His personality He was identical with the Son of God, as is evident from His testimony concerning Himself, referred to above. Yet this consciousness of identity existed in Him in an earthly manner. The immanence of His divine nature was for Him a merely ideal power, precisely as the immanence of the divine idea of our nature which we carry in our spirit is for us. On the other hand, the reality of His divine life was for Him something that lay outside of His earthly existence. And even this is in analogy with our universal human self-consciousness ; for whilst the divine idea of our nature, which idea is something eternal, even forms the immanent substratum of our earthly reality, and can even be elevated (in faith) so as to become the free principle of our personal development, and can implant itself vitally into our inmost being, the reality of our eternal life itself is for our consciousness something that lies purely beyond the horizon of our present existence.

As now the identity with the eternal Logos-*ego* in this way continued to exist in the man Jesus on the one hand, but was modified for His consciousness in an earthly manner on the other hand, so also can we say the same of the *relation which subsists reciprocally in the trinity between the Son and the Father and the Holy Ghost*, a relation which is immediately invoked in His divine nature. This relation also was not interrupted by His entrance into temporal life; it formed rather the essential, living, fundamental power of His theanthropic existence and activity on earth. But it was modified for His human consciousness on earth in an earthly manner; for He now felt Himself placed *as a human ego* into this trinitarian communion, and hence this communion assumed for Him at the same time a character of *dependence such as the creature always feels towards the Creator.* He felt therefore that He had been sent into this world by the Father, to accomplish the Father's work in the world; He felt that He was in this respect subject to the Father, as His God and Lord, as He said of the Father: "The Father is greater than I." It was necessary for Him to strengthen Himself continually for the accomplishing of the work allotted to Him, to seek the face of His heavenly Father in prayer and to derive encouragement and refreshment from the approbation of His Father in the toils, conflicts, and sufferings of His earthly vocation. In the same way also the Holy Ghost formed on earth the internal bond by which the communion of the Son with the Father in heaven was mediated. Whilst the Holy Spirit was active in the generation of the Son in the flesh only as the creative principle, to mediate His entrance into the world, this same Spirit descended at His baptism upon His person and into the depths of His being, in order to prepare Him with divine power for the accomplishment of His divine-human work on earth. He (the Spirit) communicated to Him not only special gifts as in the case of chosen men under the old dispensation. He descended upon Him in His own essence (as is shown in the symbol of the descending dove), thus filling Him with the entire fullness of His gifts,* and continued to dwell personally in Him, in order that after the work of the Son was accomplished, He might be poured out from the Son upon the whole human race, so that it might be glorified in the image of the Son.

---

* John iii. 34.

When the Son of God became man, therefore, He did not withdraw from the communion of trinitarian life; but He stood in this communion with *human* consciousness. But this could come to pass only by receiving as the animating principle of His earthly life the same disposition which prevails eternally in the holy trinity, and which also induced the Son to become incarnate, namely that of LOVE. The eternal, divine love of the Son was continued in Jesus as earthly-human love, springing with just as much necessity as freedom from His human soul, and revealing its life (also according to its essential nature) *in holy receptivity and spontaneity.* From the first moment of awaking consciousness, and thence throughout His entire life on earth, Jesus, with full freedom and truth of the human soul, kept His will open to the influence of the divine direction, which, coming partly from the depths of His own inner life, and partly from revelations continually received from above, strengthened His heart in the work of love which He had undertaken. Holy humility thus forms the fundamental characteristic in the life of the lowly Son of God.* But at the same time, whilst His entire human being was thus filled with divine powers of life, love became in Him an independent fountain of life, which streamed forth from His soul with divine-human power in the interest of His redemptive mission upon everything that approached it. And in the strength and purity of this love we find the archetypal majesty and greatness of His humanity, to which His humility serves as a vail.

But the direction of His love was twofold. Above all there dwelt in His heart love to His Father in heaven. To His Father's word He gave heed in all things, to do His will was His meat and drink, in prayer to Him He obtained strength and confidence in the temptations and difficulties of His work, and in the approbation of His Father He found peace.

---

* Matt. xi. 29.

On the other hand His love was directed toward the world, and the former (love to His Father) manifested and approved itself in the latter. Proceeding from the nearest, narrowest circle, the family, it passed over to His nation, the Israel chosen of God, to which He naturally belonged, and thence it enlarged to compass entire humanity, called to membership in the kingdom. Furthermore His love was sympathetic. The misery of our earthly life with all its frailties went to His heart, wherever it confronted Him. But above all, was it the fountain of all this misery, sin, that wakened the pain of His love, and both excited His holy wrath against the prince of this world and the children of wickedness, and called forth His pity for the poor, misled souls, that sat in the shadow and darkness of death.

And this love never rested. It continually flowed over as in the words of doctrine, the announcement of and invitation to the kingdom of God, so also in helping deeds, healing the sick and raising the dead. Yea, when it entered upon the conflict with the powers of falsehood and wickedness, it did not even fear persecution, and continued its work under the heaviest suffering until it was sealed with its death upon the cross.

In this way love formed in the deepest and most comprehensive sense the animating principle in the life of the Son of God in the state of His humiliation. And through this love, which kept Him in uninterrupted communication with the Father, the light of divine truth fell unbroken into the depths of His Spirit, from which He received strength and joyfulness of mind and will so as to hold fast to the word and will of His Father in all temptations, and faithfully to accomplish the work committed to Him. Thus His love, in which His eternal divine love was continued and worked out as human, became the light and the life of the world.

The consciousness of Jesus that He was the Son of God, and the revelation of His redeeming love in a holy walk must, however, not be regarded as something finished from the beginning. For when we read that He increased, as in stature, so in wisdom and in favor with God and man,* and that, although He was the Son of God, He learned obedience by the things which He suffered,† this gradual development is to be applied also to that relation of His eternal sonship which constituted His human personality. Yea, growth in this respect is essentially the source of His growth in all wisdom, holiness, and righteousness. This growth, however, is not to be understood as if we could conceive of any period of His life, in which the union of His human with His divine life had not as yet actually existed. The development of His God-consciousness kept pace with that of His natural self-consciousness, and His communion of love with the Father kept pace with the awaking of His moral powers, so that there was no moment of His life on earth which was not determined by the union of His human personality with the immanent, divine basis of His life.

Furthermore this development is not to be regarded as conditioned from one side only, either the divine or the human. It would be a magical conception of the life of Jesus, if we were to suppose that all progress in the same was the simple result of an immediate influence from the divine side of His nature. The truth is, such an influence could accomplish any result only in that Jesus with the full freedom of human self-determination obeyed the internal impulse. Just as little dare we assume that the divine in Him was entirely quiescent, and look for the starting point of all progress in His development exclusively in His own internal choice. We must assume much rather a living, mutual co-operation of these two factors in the life of Jesus. Every internal life-movement of His divine-human personality had its ultimate ground in an internal revelation of the divine, which formed the life-basis of His personality, and which exerted a quickening influence upon His human soul and will; and such a movement was actualized when He with human soul and conscious will obeyed this internal impulse, held it fast, and executed it without wavering. But every stage of internal growth thus accomplished made room for the immanent divine impulse, to reveal itself with increased power to His human spirit, and thus to bring to pass a still higher stage of growth. And thus there was continually accomplished a more free and full interpretation and intercommunion of life between the divine and the human in Jesus, until the union which was principally established in the beginning obtained its full, historical actualization in the life of Jesus.

---

* Luke ii. 52. † Heb. v. 8.

It is involved in the very nature of the case, that in its beginning, when the personal life as yet lay concealed in the predominant natural life, the humanity of Jesus was as yet purely passive to the influence of its immanent divine factor. This appears to be indicated in the Scriptures by the fact that in order to designate, in the early stages of the life of Jesus, His (in virtue of generation by the Holy Ghost sinless) humanity, the neuter term "that holy thing,"* is at first chosen. Afterward in the progress of the childhood of Jesus, mere passivity becomes free receptivity, and when He arrives at mature age it passes over into reacting spontaneity. To this the twofold account refers which St. Luke gives of the development of the childhood of Jesus. Upon the return of Jesus out of Egypt to Nazareth during the first years of His life we are told: "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon Him,"† where the waxing strong in spirit, forms the spiritual parallel to the development of His bodily nature, being filled with wisdom represents something that happened to Him rather than through Him, and where the grace of God is only said to be upon Him, since grace in men is called forth more definitely only through the free development of natural talents and the formation of character. On the other hand in that part of the biblical narrative in which a comprehensive view is cast upon the progressive development of His youth and early manhood comprehending the period which intervened between His visit to Jerusalem in His twelfth year, and the time when He entered upon His public Messianic work, in His thirtieth year, we have to do with a real progress in wisdom (which on account of its personal character is even placed before the parallel development of His physical nature), and in addition to favor with God we find also favor with men.*

---

* Luke i. 35. † Luke ii. 40.

In His twelfth year, Jesus already stood in conscious union with His Father in heaven, as appears from His answer to His parents: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" He was partly led to this by the special guidance which He experienced in a moral way, and partly confirmed in it by His growing insight into God's revelations in the Old Testament, which He attained by earnest inquiry into Holy Scripture, and by surrendering Himself in love to His nation. But that a sanctifying power was poured into His entire personality from this communion with His Father in the love of filial obedience, a power which impressed upon His childhood the character of actual innocence and upon His youth that of sinless purity and spotless virtue so as to make a shining example of human development—all this we learn from the conduct of John the Baptist at His baptism. For even before the Holy Ghost was poured out upon Him whereby John received the revelation concerning the divine mission and destination of Jesus to baptize the world with the Holy Ghost, he had already refused to perform for Jesus the symbolical act of purification from sins, and declared that he had need rather to be baptized by Jesus. This is a proof that he had received from the person of Jesus, whom, no doubt, he knew according to the flesh (although not yet according to the Spirit,)† as we may infer from the close connection between related Israelite families, the impression of perfect moral purity. And even the spiritualizing effect of special communion with His Father was not wanting upon the life of His inner nature. For the fact that His mother, at the marriage of Cana, so decidedly expressed the expectation that He would supply the deficiency of wine which they experienced, seems to indicate that Jesus had even before this given proof of the miraculous powers which He possessed.

His *public entrance upon His Messianic office* was decisive for the development of His divine-human life. He who was sinlessly pure submitted Himself in holy humility to the baptism of John in the feeling of fellowship with our sinful race. Then occurred the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Him, and the word of the Father came from heaven, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Thus His special divine sonship was witnessed and confirmed in a solemn manner. And in virtue of this perfectly clear conception of the extraordinary position which He assumed among the children of men, and toward God as His Father,* He knew also the special work which He had to accomplish for the world, the vocation to become the Messiah of His people, the Redeemer of the world. Whilst He was hitherto conscious primarily of His special divine sonship, He now became more distinctly conscious also through the internal testimony of the Holy Ghost, of His *special office and vocation* in this world. And if already in His twelfth year communion with His heavenly Father and obedience toward Him, were more important for Him than obedience toward His earthly parents, now all earthly and human relations retire into the background in comparison with this one thing, namely, to do the will of His Father, and to redeem humanity from the power of the devil.† Led by the Spirit into the wilderness He laid the foundation of His redemptive activity, by repelling with holy decision, referring each time to the Word of God, the temptations of Satan who by presenting to His mind the picture of false Messiahship out of Messianic pleasure, honor and dominion, sought to draw Him away from His holy vocation and to win Him to his service. And afterward He entered upon His office in preaching the kingdom of God and His righteousness, confirming the same by manifestations of saving love, by healing the sick and raising the dead. Another epoch of His divine-human life presents itself to our view in the fact that Jesus directed His mind and soul upon the suffering of death which He had to endure in order to redeem humanity, and that He assumed this most difficult part of His earthly vocation with full internal freedom, as is proved by the fact that He distinctly and repeatedly foretold such sufferings.* By this means His internal glorification, the power of which had already streamed forth in His miracles, entered upon the last stage of its accomplishment, which was revealed in that transient transfiguration of even His body on the mountain. And this highest manifestation of the obedience of the love towards His Father was also confirmed before the disciples by the testimony of the Father: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him."†

---

* Luke ii. 52.

† John i. 33.

---

* John v. 17-18. † Matt. xii. 47-50.

But the union of the Son in His state of humility with the Father in heaven attained its real completion in this, that the Son held fast this determination of His love in obedience toward the Father for the redemption of sinful humanity even in His suffering, and executed it even to His death on the cross. He expressed this after His entrance into Jerusalem by which He was delivered into the hands of His enemies when He said: "The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified;"‡ and on the last evening when Judas went out to execute his work of betrayal, Jesus announced the completion of His internal glorification thus brought to pass, by saying further: "Now is the Son of man glorified."§ But the power of this internal glorification, He revealed in this, that in the Holy Supper which He instituted as the memorial of His suffering, He fed the disciples with His body which He was now prepared to offer in death for us, and gave them His blood to drink which He was now about to shed for the remission of our sins.‖

With His death itself the work of His love was accomplished, and He could now commend His spirit into the hands of His Father to whom He was obedient even unto death. But the Father testified that the Son in His earthly humanity also maintained the union in which He stood with the Father from all eternity, and therefore He did not leave Him in the bonds of death, but raised Him up again on the third day so that He came forth from the grave in a glorified body, and afterward ascended into Heaven, to sit henceforth as the Son of man on the right hand of the Father. Although He arose, according to the spirit of holiness,* that is on this basis, that in Himself He made the spirit the principle of His life, the Father, who had sent Him for the redemption of humanity into this world of flesh, now also introduced this power of the Spirit into His external nature, which as yet held in the flesh, in order that His body might be spiritualized and glorified,† and His person in its totality be thus carried from the state of humiliation over into the state of glorification. This was the reward of His obedience even unto the death of the cross.‡

---

* Matt. xvi. 21, comp. Matt. xvii. † Matt. xvii. 1–9.

‡ John xii. 23. § John xiii. 31, 32. ‖ Compare the author: "über das heilige Abend mahl nach Lehre und Uebung," 1869, p. 18.

Thus the union of the human nature assumed by the Son, with His divine nature, a union grounded from all eternity in the triune love, passed through all the stages of development in time from birth to death, inasmuch as it was first established according to nature, taken up into His personal life with increasing clearness and freedom in virtue of His communion in love with His heavenly Father and the power of the Holy Ghost who dwelt within Him, maintained and approved by the faithful, obedient fulfilling of His redemptive mission in testifying of the kingdom of God and a holy walk, and perfected in self-sacrificing love by His atoning suffering and death. And the Father sealed it in the resurrection and exaltation of the Son to His right hand in heaven.

At His exaltation Jesus entered upon a new form of existence; from that of the flesh, He passed into that of the *Spirit.* If up to this point only His internal man was spiritualized by love, now His external man, also His entire bodily nature, was penetrated and permeated by the power of the Spirit. And this spiritualization of His body cast its reflection back again into the life of His soul, so that His entire human nature now was wholly glorified. Jesus Christ is in His exaltation spirit, spirit in the centrality of spiritual personality and in the fulness of spiritual nature and corporeity.

---

* Rom. i. 4. † Rom. vi. 4, 8, 11; Acts ii. 32. ‡ Phil. ii. 9, 10.

Yea, inasmuch as this spiritualization and glorification has been accomplished in an absolute manner in Jesus, and inasmuch as it exists for humanity principally and in a prototypal manner in Him, He is immediately called *the* Spirit* in Sacred Scripture.

In so far now as the humanity of Jesus in its totality belongs herewith to the life of perfection, it is evident that it can henceforth no longer stand in the life-form which is subject to development in the flesh, in time and finite space, but must have entered that form of life, which answers to the state of perfection, out of time into *eternity*, from this earth into *heaven*, Jesus did indeed not herewith give up His relation to this temporal world, but as God, though standing above time and space, yet all-efficaciously pervades time and space to uphold them in their natural existence, so also does the exalted Son of man forever work into this world with the power of His heavenly eternal life to fill it with a Spiritual life. Immediately after His resurrection already He revealed Himself repeatedly to His disciples in personal appearance, to teach them what they could not have borne hitherto, and to comfort them through the assurance of His indissoluble life. And having ascended into heaven, He now from on high guides His Church even to the end of the world, in that He through the Holy Ghost teaches and instructs her, by His glorified body (Leiblichkeit) feeds and nourishes her, and through His personal presence and indwelling keeps her in the true faith in all her temptations. But His life itself He henceforth no longer lives in the limits of space and time. His glorified humanity rather sits enthroned now eternally in heaven, where separation and distance no longer exist, but where His love fills all things in the power of the Spirit; He lives now as Son of Man in eternity, into which no imperfection nor any suffering extends, in which also nothing passes away nor decays, but in which everything exists in the pure presence of perfection and in the pure unfolding and revelation of His inner glory.

---

* 2 Cor. iii. 17.

Since, however, the humanity of Jesus has thus passed over into the same life of the Spirit and of glory and into the same form of existence of heaven and eternity, in which the divine life of the eternal Logos holds, it is evident that the relative separation can henceforth no longer continue, which had hitherto existed between the divine and human natures of the Son, inasmuch as the former belonged to the eternity of heaven, the latter to the temporality of earth. The Son of God lives now, as with His divine consciousness and will, so also with the consciousness and will of His human nature, in the perfection of heavenly, eternal life. The two circles of the divine and human natures around the one centre of the person of the Son of God, which we above saw divided in the two spheres of heaven and earth, of time and eternity, fall together now in the one common sphere of heaven and eternity. And in this way now the inner unity, which during the state of humiliation as to both these sides had been, though not interrupted, yet circumscribed and hemmed in in the *ego* of the Son of God, can freely reveal and unfold itself also in His outer form of existence. In His earthly humanity the Son of God had carried in Himself His eternal Logos existence only in an objective manner, as an immanent divine life-basis and as a divine authority for His human development. But, as His humanity has passed over into the life of the Spirit, His human consciousness can now also enter into the *subjective unity* with His divine consciousness, so that the consciousness of the exalted Son of Man becomes the consciousness of the Logos and *vice versa*. And as the glory of His Logos existence was for Him here below only something that lay in the past and future, so it has become for Him now an ever present reality, into the possession and enjoyment of which He herewith enters and forever remains therein.

The union presents itself to us in the same way, if we view it from the stand-point of the divine nature of the Son of God. The human nature of the Son of God, which in an ideal manner is eternally taken up by Him into the unity of His divine Being on the basis of the eternal counsel of the divine, triune love He has led forth out of its eternal ideality into its earthly reality, in order that He might in time work out its holy life, in act and suffering for the salvation of the world. Now, however, His humanity with the prize of its earthly work returns back again into eternity, forever to remain there.

And on this basis the Son of God now bears, in the fulness of its perfect reality, His human nature which existed in Him from all eternity in ideal union with His divine nature. His divine self-consciousness is become one with the consciousness of His human mode of existence in time, with His self-consciousness as the man, Jesus, who now sits as the Son of God forever at the right hand of the Father.

Whilst, therefore, in order to comprehend the theanthropism of Jesus in His state of humiliation, we had to represent it from two different points of observation, from His earthly human, since the Son of God lived on earth as the man, Jesus, and from the eternal divine, since the Son of God in communion with the Father and the Holy Ghost, eternally rules heaven and earth, whereby arose the appearance (though only the appearance) of a double personality ; now in His exaltation this appearance vanishes away; for the Son of God lives now in heaven at the right hand of the Father as the God-man, and His consciousness willing and working is a heavenly eternal one, as that of the Son of God who is both God and man in one person.

To enable us to understand more clearly how in the transition of Jesus from His state of humiliation into His exaltation and the change connected therewith in the relation of His human self-consciousness to His nature as Logos, let us take as an analogy (which, however, is no more than this) the transition of our self-consciousness from the sleeping and dreaming into the watching state. Our *ego* is the same in sleep and waking. But in sleep our real self-consciousness is driven back into latency and furnishes only the inner ground for that consciousness which moves in a different inner world. When on the contrary we awake out of sleep, we return, as to our real world, so to our true self-consciousness. But our *ego* itself has not thereby been changed. The transition into another world had only this object in view, to refresh our powers for activity in our real world. Thus this earthly mortal-life which the Son of God lived with us to His actual death, was for Him a pilgrimage into a strange and distant land. His self-consciousness *per se*, His *ego* itself, remained unchanged, but His true inner and outer world, the communion and glory of the eternal triune life, had become for Him something that lay beyond. But when He was now awakened again from death by the Father, into whose hands He had committed His Spirit in death, He awoke again to His true, full, divine-eternal self-consciousness. He was and felt Himself at home in His heavenly abode. On the other hand, His earthly life had in this way become for Him something that lay in the past. Only the significance of reward for His exaltation and the acquisition of redemption for humanity, He had taken with Him to the other side, but His *ego* itself, although in the transition from the eternal ideality through the earthly reality into the heavenly ideal-reality, it remained unchanged by the same, had only now again come into His real internal and external world.

At the same time by means of this union of the divine and the human consciousness in the exalted Son of Man, there is confirmed and strengthened in its true light the relation between time and eternity (as well as between heaven and earth)—a relation which manifests itself already in the natural working of God, or just as much one of the independence of eternity from time and the dependence of time on eternity as also one of living reciprocal action between the two. For although the humanity of the Son of God starting from its eternal ideality has made its course through temporal reality to heavenly ideal-reality, still the eternity of His divine self-consciousness, which included in His life from all eternity His relation to humanity, and in this way also His human consciousness, was not thereby interrupted. The reason of this is that although eternity consists in an uninterrupted unfolding which has its own law of life, it makes no room for development, such as exists in time, and, therefore, He could not live through one in a manner parallel with the other. But, on the other hand, the incarnation of the Son of God in time, would have been altogether impossible, if it would not have had its causative ground (principle) in the eternal decree of love for the union, *i. e.* reunion of humanity with God in the Son, and so again His eternal humanity became truly perfect and quickening only in its actualization in time.

If, however, this heavenly-eternal union of the divine and human nature in the Person of Christ shall be recognized by us in its true living character, we must have regard at the same time to the *mutual interpenetration* which exists in this nature between the divine and human life of Christ Jesus, the exalted Son of God and man.

And here the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* as held by the Lutheran Church, whose application to the earthly, temporal life of Jesus we were obliged already to resist, comes to its just rights and its full meaning, although even here it can be understood and honored only upon the ground, that the human nature which Christ assumed in time stood from all eternity in its ideal essence already in union with His divine nature.

The *effect of the divine nature of the God-man upon His human nature* is one side of this mutual penetration of natures. A certain participation in the divine nature is promised, it is true, to men generally upon the ground of our redemption through Christ; he that by faith in divine grace becomes a member of the body of Christ, who had already been foreordained as the first born of every creature to become the principle of our communion with God, and had become the first-born from the dead for their redemption, shall through Him become partaker of the divine nature.* Still, although this is not to be understood in a figurative nor in a mere moral sense, but as a real union of our personality with God in Christ, the influence of the divine upon our human nature, in consequence of that state of independence in which the divine personality must forever stand to the human, cannot lift this latter above the limits of that power and glory, to which our nature in itself was limited from the creation onwards.

But we must admit of a still higher measure of influence upon

---

*** 2 Pet. i. 4. Compare also 1 John iii. 2.**

the human nature of Christ, because in this case no separation between personalities takes place, but a union of two natures in one person. We may learn how to understand this from the influence, which the body receives from the soul, with which it stands united in one personal life; not merely does the soul breathe life into the body, but it expresses also its internal activities in the countenance, features and gestures of the body, and by means of it all its own internal motions have free play for inward activity. So now in like manner Christ's human nature and form of existence, by virtue of the union aforesaid in His one person, must also partake in the powers of His divine nature and form of existence. Whilst then certainly our nature when once in a state of glorification can no longer be bound to the limits of space or to the limitations of the flesh, but is capacitated by the power of the Spirit there to be and there to work, where the internal attraction of love draws it; yet nevertheless Jesus after His resurrection did not give His disciples merely the promise, Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,* but He also testifies concerning Himself, likewise thus: All power is given unto me in heaven and upon earth.† And this applies in the unqualified sense in which it is said. As human nature by virtue of its being fully in the image of the divine is enabled to pursue its destiny, so the humanity of Christ continually participates in the power and glory which He as the Son of God possesses in consequence of His divine nature. Not only as the Logos, but also as the man Jesus, He is the Lord,‡ who rules over all, § and to whom the angels are in subjection.‖ Not only with His eternal Spirit, but also with His glorified body, He can be everywhere present and communicate Himself to whomsoever He will: not only with divine power does He govern heaven and earth, but the work is also carried forward by the powers of His human nature.¶ And Jesus was therefore from the resurrection inwards worshiped,** prayed to†† and directly adored as "God over all."‡‡

*** Matt. xxviii. 20. † xxviii. 18. ‡ Acts ii. 36. § Heb. i. 8; John xvii. 5, 24. ‖ 1 Peter v. 22. ¶ Matt. xxviii. 18. ** John xx. 28; Phil. ii. 10. †† 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 13. ‡‡ Rom. ix. 5, compare also Revelation.**

And yet, although according to this the Son of God enjoys divine power and honor also according to His human form of existence, still this elevation of the human into the divine nature must not be conceived of as a change into the divine nature, not as a deification. Rather, as the body, although in personal union with the soul it takes part in all its activities, and thereby becomes vital, spiritual and also psychic in character, without changing itself into a psychic existence, remains forever body, and acts only as a conditioned organ in the service of the Lord, whilst its vital power goes forth from the soul, so the humanity of Jesus, notwithstanding its participation in the divine government and working of the Son of God, nevertheless continues forever within the limitations of a human existence. For, as in its glorification, it serves the Son of God as an all penetrating, an always willing organ, so it never exists nor works with creature and conditioned power and glory, but only as a creature subject to conditions.

Thus the above-mentioned law of love, which, with entire self-devotion in the union, nevertheless maintains throughout self-preservation, requires and realizes this as an actual result, to wit, that the union should not be reduced to an outward mixture or mere mechanical union, but should become a real unity.

The exaltation of Jesus, accordingly, is not limited to a mere spiritualization and glorification of His human nature, which was especially the case in His resurrection, but is expanded in consequence of His entrance into heaven into an actual oneness with the Godhead, that is, into such an interpenetration with the powers of His divine nature, and into such an illumination by its divine glory, that it remains forever under its power and lustre.

But then inasmuch as the Divine nature of Christ, with its living powers, works over upon His human nature, the union can be maintained as a real unity only as a corresponding *influence of the human upon the divine* is at the same time admitted. This, of course, must not be so regarded, as if by this means the divine nature experienced any limitation of its power and glory. Such a supposition is opposed to the very nature of the absolute. But this latter does nevertheless lay itself open to such an influence in so far as it henceforth lives not for itself, but in loving devotion to the human nature, which He has determined to take up into complete communion with Himself. This decree was fulfilled ideally, as we have seen, already in eternity by the eternal incarnation of the Son, and also when by virtue of this decree He actually appeared on the earth, in the flesh, by taking upon Himself our human nature; whilst at the same time, the Father was well pleased with Him, the Son of man, and through Him, with humanity; so it becomes clearly manifest, how God continues His eternal, trinitarian life, not in Himself, but through His Son, in and with the creature formed in His image. But this love union of God with humanity in His beloved Son, came to its completion for the first time in His elevation to a seat at the right hand of the throne in heaven. Inasmuch as the Son of God lives no longer as mere God, but also as man in the communion of His Father in heaven, so also must His humanity, although under the limitation of a creature, take part in the threefold activity of God. But just by this means has this latter acquired a new significance and new life-contents. For as Christ has gone into the heavens, He has taken with Him there the entire fruit of His life in the flesh, and of His holy death for mankind at large; and resting on this, as its ground, His mediatorial activity, whereby He again reconciled to God our fallen humanity; unites itself with his demiurgic activity, by which He governs heaven and earth. His natural creative energy has in this way been enlarged into a spiritual one, and not the reverse; for this latter continues without interruption in eternity, and His government of the world becomes a restoration and a completion of the kingdom of God. And this indicates an essentially higher development of the activity of His life, as it also brings with it a higher stadium for the life of humanity and of the world.

During the servant-form of His life on earth there was in connection with the relative separation of the two forms of His existence, likewise a relative separation or division in His twofold activity. His mere demiurgic work had indeed preserved the natural stability of the world, but He must leave the power of sin, which had been brought in, to continue unresolved. On the other hand, in His state of humiliation, He had, it is true, borne our misery with us and for us, but He was not able at once to apply to us the blessing of this His compassionate love; because for this purpose a divinely conditional power was requisite, which, as mere man, He did not possess. But now since the Son of God by virtue of His exaltation, has united His activity in heaven as the Son of God and as the Son of Man, the creative energies of his Logos-existence within the sphere of His mediatory work as the Son of Man pass over into a real new creation of humanity on the one hand, and on the other, the mediatory powers of His humanity unite with His demiurgic activities as the Son of God in the spiritualizing of nature, in a real glorification of the world.

It is clear how in this way the union of God and man in Jesus Christ is brought about. His self-consciousness as the God-Man is one that is no longer divided by the limits of time and space, but one that exists in pure unity. His love gushes forth at the same time from a divine and human heart, and all His life-powers and attributes bear a pure divine-human character. In this union of both forms of life He is truly our high priest and shepherd, the Lord who will judge the world at the time appointed, the head of His Church, which he will perfect in His kingdom.* As the God-man Himself He verily stands in the life-circle of the divine trinity;† the life which He had from all eternity from the Father, He receives also as man, and the Holy Ghost, who goeth forth from Him eternally as the Son, proceedeth no less from Him as the Son of Man;* the love itself, with which the Father eternally loves the Son, applies in the same degree to His humanity; and so also He loves the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost, returning His love from a human as well as a divine heart and fulfilling His will in His kingdom with human as well as divine powers.

---

* Eph. i. 22, 23. Acts iii. 19, 21. † Col. ii. 9.

In this eternal, heavenly theanthropism of the Son, *the mystery of love* has then also completed itself. That perfect union and unity, which is the end of love and which, whilst it holds within the limits of self-protection, and is reached in the way of perfect self-devotion by mutual participation and communication, is here truly and absolutely realized between God and humanity as well as the creation generally. What the divine love willed from eternity, and is the ground and end of the creation, that is here in principle fulfilled for all eternity. The God-man is the personal life centre of the kingdom of God, in which His love is spread abroad in its entire fulness and glory. From Him proceeds all the love, which in this kingdom unites God with his creature, the creature with God, and all creatures with one another; from Him go forth the powers of the Spirit, which spiritually renews the world, brings it into perfect harmony of life and completes its inward and outward glory; and from Him flows forth into the creation the divine life, so as to unite it with God in a glorified state.* In him eternity becomes one with time, and time is taken up in eternity. In him heaven has come down upon the earth, and the earth is elevated into an heavenly existence; He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, He that is and that was and that is to come, the Almighty,† whose are the kingdoms of the world, and who shall reign from everlasting to everlasting.‡ Amen.

---

* John xiv. 16. † Rev. i. 8. ‡ Rev. xi. 15.

Art. VIII.—THE PRESBYTERIAN THEORY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

In the October number of the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, there is an article on Infant Baptism which professes to set forth the Presbyterian theory on this subject, and it is endorsed as such by the editors of the *Review* in the following words: "We are quite clear that the main positions taken by Mr. White" (the author of the article), "are in accord with our standards, when their meaning is fairly elicited by a comparison of their various parts, and that these in turn are in accord with the Scriptures."

We will first give the theory and then make some criticisms upon it.

1. Baptism is the *official initiatory rite* of the visible Church. This is the first point. The writer distinguishes this character of the sacrament from (*a*) that public confession of Christ before men that our Lord so pointedly commands, and (*b*) from the "door," which he erroneously makes synonymous with *entering* the Church.

2. Baptism symbolizes, and thus has implied reference to, that radical change in the soul that we commonly call "regeneration." This proposition the writer fortifies by a number of Scripture passages. John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 12; Col. iii. 1; Tit. iii. 5.

3. Baptism, as a sacrament, is an instrument and medium, through which the Holy Ghost conveys to those by whom it is worthily received, spiritual grace.

That Baptism is such an instrument and medium of the Holy Ghost, the writer says, is to be inferred from the frequent connection in the Scriptures of the ideas of baptism with water and with the Spirit. The references are Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 38; Acts xix. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xii. 13. He adds: That grace of some sort is conveyed to those who worthily receive baptism is denied only by those, who hold the very lowest view of the sacraments.

Then follows a quotation from Hodge's Theology, Vol. III. p. 589 to the following effect: "Baptism is not only a sign and seal, it is also a means of grace, because in it the blessings which it signifies are conveyed, and the promises of which it is the seal are assured or fulfilled to those who are baptized, provided they believe. Unless the recipient of this sacrament be insincere, baptism is an act of faith, it is an act in which and by which he receives and appropriates the offered benefits of the redemption of Christ."

In the next place, the writer gives us the "conditions in the recipient prerequisite to the administration of baptism, which are the following:

1. Membership in the visible Church.
2. Presumptive Regeneration.
3. Capability of receiving spiritual grace.

The first condition as applicable to infants is established by numerous references to the Old Testament and the New.

In regard to the second, he says: "Baptism, as we have seen, symbolizes regeneration, but *presumptive* regeneration is all that we can predicate of any candidate, whether old or young," and then goes on to show, that "the regeneration of infants is *possible*," that "this moral change wrought by the Holy Ghost is *possible* in the case of children of believers, and that Scripture expressions encourage us to *expect* it." "Facts in the Church favor the belief, that the children of believers are to be presumed to be regenerate till the contrary appears." "All churches that baptize infants do so upon the ground that they may be regenerated in infancy."

The third condition follows from admitting the second; for if infants are capable of being regenerated, as implying a moral change, then they must be capable of receiving spiritual grace. We quote here as highly significant the further comments of the editor of the *Presbyterian Review* on this article.

"We deem the doctrinal aspect of the subject important, because of its practical bearings upon Christian nurture and training. In our view God's covenant TO BE A GOD to our children, and the consequent annexation of the sacramental seal of His covenanted grace, puts them within the pale of the visible, or presumptive people of God—to whose very position, therefore, it belongs to think and feel, and live and act as the children of God, in all the ways appropriate to their years. They are to be dealt with as those who are not outsiders to the Church, who may not consistently cast their lot with and live like heathens and publicans, until they undergo a conscious, inward transformation, of which they can give a clear account. 'They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to please God, and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ' (*Directory for Worship*, Chap. IX), and that any other course is just as recreant to their covenanted privileges and obligations, and place in the Church, as in older persons who have come to the Lord's Table making a formal profession of religion. Further, agreeably to our Directory just quoted, they are to be taught and trained to have in view the coming to their first communion in the due exercise of faith and repentance, as soon as they reach the period of knowledge and discretion, when they can properly understand the meaning of the act, and take upon themselves its obligations.

It is our full belief, that Christian nurture and training conducted on these principles, would result in saving very many children of the covenant who are now, under a different theory, made to feel that their place and their sympathies are rather 'in the seat of scorners,' than in 'the congregation of the righteous,' and that a correspondent manner of living befits this position till at some future time they suffer some shock and commotion of soul consciously *ab extra* issuing in conversion. We fear that the effect of placing them virtually in such a conscious attitude is to make multitudes of them more and more aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world; and that great numbers thus cast upon the dark mountains of sin, are left to wander and stumble to perdition.

On the other hand, we believe, that bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, in accordance with the doctrine and method of our standards, would be so attended with the presence and inworking of the Holy Spirit, that the manifestations of His sanctifying influence would grow with their growth, and strengthen with their strength; that we should witness multiplying and delightful instances of those sanctified from infancy, yea, even from the womb; that Christian piety would be more ripe, mellow, and symmetrical; that, inwrought into all the springs and habitudes of action through the formative period of life, it would develop into a robust and beautiful prime, making the hoary head a crown of glory; that thus the Church, by a normal development, would prolong and enlarge itself more by internal evolution than external aggregation. It is not indeed to be expected, that children will cease to be children, or that 'young Christians' will be wholly free from the follies of youth, any more than older Christians will be without spot or wrinkle, this side heaven. Nay, many children of the covenant, like many older professors, may prove Christians only in name. 'All are not Israel that are of Israel.' It may, like any other system, be perverted to formalism. With all due allowance for this, we believe that the true conception of infant baptism and church-membership, duly carried out in Christian nurture, would prove an inestimable gain to the cause of religion in the family, the Church and society. It is more nearly realized in the Presbyterianism of Scotland than in this country. In our opinion, it has much to do with the hold which this glorious type of Christianity obtains and retains on all classes of the Scotch people, high and low, rich and poor, from generation to generation. Many of their Churches, under zealous, evangelical pastors, have an almost constant revival, in the continual accession, with devout preparation and intelligent faith, of their baptized children to the Lord's Table.

The ground of infant baptism assigned by Mr. White is largely given in the Reformed theology and symbols, from which our own are largely derived. Thus the first Helvetic Confession gives as a reason for the baptism of infants, that *de eorum electione piè est præsumendum.*

Vitringa says: 'When God hath begun to manifest His grace to the parents, or either of them, we may not presume otherwise than that He will confer the like grace upon their infants, so long as the contrary does not appear: *Non licet aliter præsumere quam illam leandem gratiam præstiturum infantibus, quamdiu nobis non liquat contrarium.*' For more passages to the same effect from DE MOOR, MARKIUS, WITSIUS, etc., see the little volume issued by our Board, entitled *Children of the Church and Sealing Ordinances*, pp. 101 *et seq.* Dr. Watts says: 'In my opinion, so far as they (infants) are in any way members of the *visible* Church, it is upon *supposition* of their being (with their parents) members of the *invisible* Church of God.' 'Supposition' here is equivalent to 'presumption,' in the sense above."

Criticism.

It will be seen, that this theory goes on the presumption that the children of believers are regenerated in their infancy. The main question in the case for the writer in the *Presbyterian Review* evidently is, whether that great and radical change referred to by our Lord in His discourse with Nicodemus is possible in the case of infants. He presses this point: "There have been many discussions concerning the nature of original sin and the possibility of innate guilt, but the generally received Catholic view always has been, that every soul possesses *a moral character of some kind*, antecedent to its actual conscious choices. Thus by changes wrought in that moral character every soul, even before self-consciousness, is capable of receiving spiritual grace; and infants, when brought by believing parents to the sacrament of baptism, may receive, or may have already received, that promised grace which, in the words of the Westminster Confession, is "not only offered but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto according to the counsel of God's own will in His appointed time."

Just at this point, we take it, is to be found the chief objection to infant baptism. Can infants be regenerated? If they can, then it is easy to see how a rite can be appointed as its sign and seal, a rite which will not be an empty ceremony but a grace-bearing sacrament.

We question whether the idea of regeneration in the Ancient Church, went quite so far as the idea of this writer in the *Presbyterian Review.* He seems to have in his mind something of the modern conception of the moral change wrought in conversion, although he does very properly, in one place, distinguish between the two, when he says: "Regeneration is the work of the Holy Ghost, transforming the soul. It is the divine side of that great change, of which the human side is 'repentance' (*μετάνοια*) or conversion." He does not hesitate to speak of it as *a moral change*, whereas the convention of Bishops assembled in Baltimore several years ago declared, that baptism must not be thought to effect any *moral change*, in which declaration they evidently referred to regeneration in the old Church sense as connected with baptism.

But be this as it may, this Presbyterian theory does not hesitate to say that infants may be regenerated, in the sense of the new birth, or the birth from above, as spoken of by our Lord in His discourse to Nicodemus. It goes further, and says they are to be baptized on the *presumption that they are regenerated.* Some may not be regenerate, but all are presumed to be.

Now the point to be particularly noticed here is, what determines certainly which infants of believing parents are regenerated and which not. This clearly (although now-a-days Presbyterians keep it in the back-ground) is the secret election of God. This comes out in the Westminster Confession, where it says, that in baptism grace is not only offered, but *really exhibited and conferred* by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) *as that grace belongeth unto* ACCORDING TO THE COUNSEL OF GOD'S OWN WILL.

The Presbyterian can go quite as far as the most ultra-Romanist in asserting a regeneration *ex opere operato*, only he asserts it in connection with the abstract will or counsel of God, whereas the Romanist asserts it in connection with a sacrament. We cannot see how the Presbyterian can consistently refute the Roman theory; for if God can regenerate infants by an act of His will, why can He not do it in connection with the administration of a sacrament? The objection cannot be made against the *ex opere operato* method, but only in applying the grace to *all* infants that are baptized, the Presbyterian allowing it only in the case of elect infants. That is all the difference. And the Romanist has the best of the argument on his side; for according to the Presbyterian theory no man can know certainly that he received any grace in his baptism, because he cannot know whether he is one of the elect.

This is a weak point in Presbyterian theology; for it militates against their assertion also, that all infants dying in infancy are saved. The writer of this article asserts this as his belief. He says, "We believe that *all* children dying in unconscious infancy are saved. They enter heaven only as redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and as with a moral nature transformed by the power of the Holy Ghost. Their first conscious thought must be in harmony with the will of God, but the great moral change—their regeneration—preceded it while they were still unconscious." Dr. Hodge asserts that this is Presbyterian doctrine. But it is a palpable misrepresentation of Calvinism as bearing on this point, as Dr. Krauth has pointed out by quotations from standard Calvinistic authors.

If the grace of baptism is given only to those "to whom it belongeth according to the counsel of God's own will," and if only "*elect* infants dying in infancy are saved," how can these latter exponents of Calvinism assert, that, according to the teaching of Calvinism all infants dying in infancy are saved? Why then put in the word "elect" at all?

But leaving out of the case now this peculiar element in the Presbyterian doctrine of baptism (which lurks under that word "presumed to be regenerated"), we hold it to be the main fact, that the children of believing parents are presumed to be regenerated in infancy, and that they are to be baptized on this presumption.

This is a great concession for Presbyterians to make. It requires them, as confessed in the quotation from the Editors given above, to fall back upon the old system of educational religion, which belongs to original Presbyterianism, and was practiced on when that Church used to keep up catechetical instruction. In later times they have fallen, practically, at least, into the Puritan and Methodist theory of regeneration, which identifies it with conversion.

Do Presbyterians preach this doctrine? Do they say to their baptized members, "You are to presume that you are a regenerate person, and on the basis of this you are to receive the instructions of the Church and become prepared to assume your baptismal vows?" Has it not rather been the effort to bring them to repentance and faith, and on the basis of this to predicate their regeneration as a fact in their lives, which dates from such conscious experience? We are not saying here what should be the character of the address to the baptized, but what it should be on the basis of this Presbyterian theory. It is easy to see, that it is embarrassed by the doctrine of election; for the child must presume, that it is regenerated, provided it has been elected. But inasmuch as the decree of election is secret and unknown, they are to take for granted that they are also of the elect, and to be certain of it when they see the fruits of it in their experience and life. But even with this embarrassment it would be a great matter, if all Presbyterian Churches would make account, even as they used to do, of educational religion and catechetical instruction.

We take issue with this theory when it asserts, that men are to be baptized on the presumption that they *have previously been* regenerated. And we think the article we are criticizing furnishes sufficient evidence to overthrow this assertion. It is the most natural interpretation of the passages of Scripture quoted in the article to understand that the grace signified is actually conferred in baptism, as indeed the Westminster Confession asserts, "Except a man be born of the water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This passage the writer quotes among those referring to baptism. "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, *and ye shall* receive the Holy Ghost." "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." These and other passages seem to connect the reception of the grace with the administration of the sacrament. *There is but one case in the baptisms recorded in the New Testament, in which the communication of the Spirit preceded baptism.* "The communication of the Spirit, and consequently regeneration, in this case (of Cornelius), *before* baptism, is striking, and without parallel in the New Testament. In all other cases, as with the Samaritans, the gift of the Spirit *accompanied* or followed baptism and the laying on of hands." (Dr. Schaff's Hist. Apos. Church, p. 222.)

Why then should this writer reverse this order, and say that the grace which baptism symbolizes is universally conferred before baptism? There is no reason for this. It is unnatural. As well might you say, that it is to be presumed that every one who comes to the Lord's Supper *has* previously received the specific grace connected with the observance of this holy sacrament, and the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine is only a symbol of a transaction already taken place. But we do not do this. Presbyterians do not speak thus of this sacrament. Whatever grace is bestowed is received in connection with the eating and drinking.

This view, that baptism symbolizes a fact or event already consummated is the Baptist theory, which the writer opposes. It comes from an interpretation given to the words, "He that believeth *and* is baptized shall be saved." But if we are to frame a theory from the mere order of the words here, then we should do the same in the words, "Except a man be born of the water *and* the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." We would suppose that the order of the words is as important in the one case as in the other.

Now when we consider, that the writer asserts that the baptism of infants has precisely the same significance as the baptism of adults (on the third page of his article), we ought to conclude that we should follow the order exhibited in the New Testament, and not *vice versa*, as the Baptist theory does. Moreover it is reasonable. If God can regenerate a child before it is baptized, some time between its birth and its baptism, why may He not regenerate it when it is baptized? This would agree with the use of human *initiatory* rites. An organization that has such a rite makes the administration of the rite and entrance into the organization synchronous. The person may be elected before, and have all the necessary qualifications, but he is not a member until he is initiated.

Then we have the unanimous view of the early Church on this subject, and the idea of a sacrament as held in all ages to support our position. It is not necessary to enlarge on this point. The whole conception of the mysteries of Christianity requires us to hold, that its sacraments are not merely external rites, but signs and seals of grace. And the writer of this article comes to this also in a singular way. His third point in defining the sacrament is, "*Baptism, as a sacrament, is an instrument and medium, through which the Holy Ghost conveys to those by whom it is worthily received spiritual grace.*"

This is a strong statement. It allows all that is claimed by the advocates of baptismal regeneration, so far as the question as to the relation of the outward sign to the inward grace is concerned. The old objection, that the Holy Ghost does not join His activities with the administration of an outward rite, is set aside. A certain kind of grace is conferred in the administration of the sacrament. And the sacrament is "the instrument and medium through which" it is conveyed. We need not question how this can be any more than we need question how God could join the healing of Naaman with his washing seven times in the river Jordan.

But the article leaves us in the dark as to what the specific grace is which is conferred in baptism. According to the writer the grace of regeneration is conferred previous to baptism. Some other grace then is conferred in baptism. What is its character? Is it a confirming and strengthening grace? How then is it distinguished from the grace conferred in partaking of the Lord's Supper? The writer is evidently involved in confusion here. Baptism in the New Testament is spoken of as the sacrament of regeneration. It is called the laver of regeneration. The article says that it symbolizes, and thus has implied reference to, that radical change in the soul that we commonly call "regeneration." If this be so, why then does the writer make it an immediate and direct sign of some other grace, and refer it only remotely to the grace of regeneration? We can explain this only on the supposition, that he wishes to avoid a certain conclusion. He dreads the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and still more the *ex opere operato* theory. This it is that leads him to avoid the very conclusions to which his premises point.

Our limits do not allow us to extend this criticism. We close with the following remarks.

1. We think the writer aims at the accomplishment of an important purpose, in seeking to point the Presbyterian Church to a better view of baptism, than that it is a mere empty sign. That is what is practically held by a great portion of his Church. The consequence is, that the administration of baptism to infants has come to be sadly neglected in that Church. The General Assembly has repeatedly noticed and lamented the fact. Years ago Dr. Nevin called attention to the fact, that the Presbyterian Church and Puritanism generally, had fallen away from the old Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and he maintained it in a masterly work on "The Mystical Presence," and in a subsequent discussion with Dr. Hodge, who was brought to review his book only by the pressure of a special necessity. Here is a confession that that Church has fallen away also from the old Reformed doctrine of baptism. We hope the article we have criticised, and the words of the Editors of the *Review* in which it appeared, may serve to call attention to the fact.

2. The Reformed doctrine of baptism which joins the grace of regeneration (in the old Church sense of regeneration,—not the modern which confounds it with conversion) with the application of water in the administration of the sacrament of baptism, is not, by any means, the Roman doctrine. The Roman doctrine of natural depravity, or the state of the child by birth, is very different from the Protestant doctrine. And the Roman theory, that baptism places the subject in a state of innocency, completes the work, so that he need only to watch and guard against a fall from that state of innocency, and if he fall to seek restoration again in the sacrament of Penance, is widely different from the Protestant conception, that baptism is only the foundation and beginning of a growth in which sanctification is realized. But we cannot dwell further upon this point now.

RECENT PUBLICATION.

LIBRARY OF CHOICE FICTION. "May," by Mrs. Oliphant, Author of "At His Gates," "Chronicles of Carlingford," "Miss Majoribanks," &c., &c. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

PATER MUNDI; OR, DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION. Being in substance Lectures delivered in various Colleges and Theological Seminaries. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Cœlum" and "Ad Fidem," and lecturer on the scientific evidences of religion, in Amherst College. Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, No. 117 Washington Street. 1873.

THE HOLY BIBLE, ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION (A. D. 1611,) WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY AND A REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. II. Joshua.—1 Kings. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1873.

This is what has been known as The Speaker's Commentary, because it was entered upon, if we mistake not, at the suggestion of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The volume before us is admirably brought out by Scribner, Armstrong & Co. The binding is rich, plain, and substantial. The paper and type are of a quality in keeping with the character of the work. Altogether it is a volume pleasant to the eye, and an ornament as well as an addition to the library.

A stupendous work is being done in our day in the way of bringing out the wealth of the Sacred Scriptures. The advanced views that have come to be entertained in regard to these Scriptures, according to which, while their inspiration is firmly maintained, the human factor in them is more fully recognized, have conduced to add new interest to their critical study. The attacks made upon them also by modern infidelity, has induced new investigation, so that altogether the conditions are at hand for such a study of the Bible as has never been devoted to it in any preceding age.

This Speaker's Commentary will circulate most largely in England. But the enterprising Publishing House that has undertaken to bring it out in this country has no doubt calculated with good assurance on a wide circulation also in this country. It is not as voluminous as Lange's Commentary, but it contains just such helps and explanations as the reader needs, without being cumbered with learning. For the general reader of the Scriptures it is a valuable help, and its investigations and criticisms are made in the light of the most advanced Biblical scholarship.

THE REFORMATION. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.

Elsewhere in this REVIEW we have made this work the occasion for expressing a few thoughts on the general subject of Theological Science in America. We add here, that our examination of the work has produced a favorable impression in reference to its ability and clearness of style. It reveals ability, for it is the production of one who has studied well his theme. The list of works on the Reformation given in Appendix II., covering twenty-five pages, shows the varied material which the author has consulted and from which he has gathered. Appendix I. contains a valuable chronological table. But while the work reveals ability, and its method is clear, and style excellent, it has some defects. The Lutherans will not be quite satisfied with the author's statement, that Luther's view was that there are two substances in the sacrament, or consubstantiation. The German Reformed may justly complain, that Prof. Fisher has entirely ignored the rise of the Reformed Church in the Palatinate. Surely this is quite as important as the rise of the Reformed Church in Geneva or in France, to which chapters are devoted. There seems also to be a want of appreciation of the central and fundamental significance of the Sacramental controversy, and in a few points not the best statement of the different views that entered into the controversy.

But we could not expect everything, even of importance, connected with the Reformation to be brought into the compass of one volume.

YEAR-BOOK OF NATURE AND POPULAR SCIENCE FOR 1872. Edited by John C. Draper, M. D., Professor of History and Physiology in the College of the City of New York, and of Chemistry in the University Medical College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.

A volume gathering up the results of the progress of science, more particularly natural science, during the past year. It comprises general sections or heads, on 1. Mathematical and Physical Science; 2. Chemistry; 3. Geology; 4. Social Science; 5. General Biology; 6 Mechanical Science. It is properly called a Year-Book. Every one, who wishes to keep posted in the new things of Science, and to become acquainted with many valuable hints in regard to them, will seek to get this book. It is brought out in handsome style.

☞ The above Notices were crowded out of the last number of the REVIEW; which fact accounts for this late insertion.

3 1198 04015 1487
N/1198/04015/1487X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 1487

N/1198/04015/1487X